



**INDIANA
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY
BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE
FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

VOL. XXXII

BALTIMORE: THE EDITOR
LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO.
PARIS: ALBERT FONTEMOING LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS

1911

84013

P1

.A5

v. 32



The Lord Baltimore Press
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

VT123456789

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXII.

No. 125.

I.—Vahlen's Ennius. By CHARLES KNAPP,	I
II.—The Indo-European Palatals in Sanskrit. By LEONARD BLOOMFIELD,	36
III.—The Introduction of Masks on the Roman Stage. By CATHARINE SAUNDERS,	58
IV.—K and Π Forms in the Early Ionic Poets. By T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS,	74
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	85
Bywater's Aristotle on the Art of Poetry.—Petersen's Greek Diminutives in <i>-iov</i> . A Study in Semantics.—Bender's The Suffixes <i>-mant</i> and <i>-vant</i> in Sanskrit and Avestan.	
REPORTS:	98
Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik.—Philologus.	
BRIEF MENTION,	112
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	123
BOOKS RECEIVED,	127

No. 126.

I.—Horatian Urbanity in Hesiod's Works and Days. By E. K. RAND,	131
II.—Latin Inscriptions at the Johns Hopkins University. VI. By HARRY LANGFORD WILSON,	166
III.—Hiatus in the Accentual Clausulae of Byzantine Greek Prose. By HENRY B. DEWING,	188
IV.—Buddha as Tathāgata. By E. WASHBURN HOPKINS,	205

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	210
Ridgeway, The Origin of Tragedy.—Farinelli's Dante e la Francia dall' età media al secolo di Voltaire.—Hoskier, The Golden Latin Gospels.—Buchanan's New Edition of the Codex Veronensis (<i>b</i>).	
REPORTS:	222
Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik.—Report of Revue de Philologie.	
BRIEF MENTION,	230
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	243
BOOKS RECEIVED,	247

No. 127.

I.—The House-Door in Greek and Roman Religion and Folk-Lore.	
By M. B. OGLE,	251
II.—Lucilius on <i>EI</i> and <i>I</i> . By ROLAND G. KENT,	
	272
III.—The Conventions of the Pastoral Elegy. By GEORGE NORLIN,	
	294
IV.—Repeated Verses in Homer. By JOHN A. SCOTT,	
	313
V.—Notes on Juvenal. By E. H. STURTEVANT,	
	322
VI.—The Endings <i>-Ere</i> and <i>-Erunt</i> in Dactylic Hexameter. By R. B. STEELE,	
	328
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	333
Bennett's Syntax of Early Latin.—Clark's Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum Libri qui Supersunt.	
REPORTS:	348
Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.—Romania.	
BRIEF MENTION,	358
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	368
BOOKS RECEIVED,	372

No. 128.

I.—The Significance of the Parodoi in the Greek Theater. By KELLEY REES,	
	377
II.—Derivatives of the Root <i>bhē(y)</i> - 'To strike, bind'. By EDWIN W. FAY,	
	403

CONTENTS.

v

III.—The Date of Aristophanes' Georgoi. By EDWARD CAPPS, . . .	421
IV.—A Slavic Analogy to Verner's Law. By E. PROKOSCH, . . .	431
V.—Tagalog Verbs Derived from other Parts of Speech. By FRANK R. BLAKE,	436
VI.—Asokan Miscellany. By TRUMAN MICHELSON,	441
VII.—Identification of the Ancient Persian Month Garmapada in the Light of the Recently Found Aramaic Papyrus Fragments. By H. C. Tolman,	444
VIII.—A Note on the Etymology of Involare. By ARTHUR B. MYRICK.	446
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	448
Birt's Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie Vergils.—Barbagallo's Lo Stato e l'Istruzione Pubblica nell' Impero Romano.	
REPORTS:	461
Hermes.—Philologus.	
BRIEF MENTION,	478
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	490
BOOKS RECEIVED,	493
INDEX,	495

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXII, 1.

WHOLE No. 125.

I.—VAHLEN'S ENNIUS.¹

On September 27 last Johannes Vahlen celebrated his eightieth birthday. In Germany a committee of his "Freunde, Schüler und Verehrer" had been formed to do him honor, and had invited the lovers of the Classics everywhere to contribute to a fund to aid in this purpose.

I had long planned to discuss at least a part of the second edition of Vahlen's Ennius, but divers things had postponed the realization of the project. I hope that the timeliness of the present examination, if I may intrude a word borrowed from journalism within the precincts of classical scholarship, will offset the long gap between the appearance of the book and the present review. Besides, most of the topics treated in this paper are of perennial interest to the serious student of things Roman.²

In 1854 Vahlen, then twenty-four years old, issued a collection of the fragments of Ennius; in 1903, *aetate provectus*, he set forth the ripe results of nearly half a century of further study of the same author. It goes without saying that the new edition does not merely expand the old: it is essentially a different book.³

¹ *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*. Iteratis curis recensuit Iohannes Vahlen. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner (1903). Pp. ccxxiv + 306. 16 marks.

² I know of no searching review of the book in English or German. Skutsch's article on Ennius in *Pauly-Wissowa* 5, 2589-2628 has Vahlen's book ever in mind; the present paper, however, does not cross that article at many points, and even in those is wholly independent thereof.

³ A most excellent way of realizing how far apart the two editions are is to compare the *Index Sermonis* of the new with the *Index Verborum* of the old; one sees thus how widely Vahlen's later groupings of the fragments differ at times from his earlier combinations. The changes in his views concerning the groupings involved great changes in the *Prolegomena* of the later book.

In 1854 Vahlen could write justly enough in his Praefatio that there was then "vix ulla editio Ennii quae desiderio paullo severiori satis facere possit". Only thrice before that year had scholars attempted to edit all the Ennian fragments together. In 1564 the Stephani had brought out a collection of fragments of Ennius, Pacuvius, Accius, etc., etc. In 1590 Hieronymus Columna published the fragments of Ennius by themselves. The work showed industry, knowledge of Ennius's language, and skill in the interpretation of individual lines. But inevitably, in the absence of the proper subsidia (see below), the text was often defective. Finally, Columna made no attempt to combine the fragments into coherent groups of verses, a grievous shortcoming, to Vahlen's mind. In 1707 Hessel brought out a Variorum revision and amplification of Columna's edition. Of these works, as of the labors of various scholars on *parts* of Ennius, Vahlen wrote in the original book, pages v-vii; he speaks of them at greater length in the later work, cxxxi-cxxv. Especially interesting in the latter account is what is said (cxxxiv) of the stimulus given to Ennian studies by Ritschl; surely pardonable to a senex saepissime a viris laudandis laudatus is the reproduction of the praise heaped by the Senate of the University of Bonn on Vahlen's studies in the *Annales* of Ennius (1852) presented in competition for a prize which, at Ritschl's suggestion, the University had offered for work in Ennius. In 1852 came, also, Ribbeck's *Fragmenta Tragicorum Romanorum*.

Such was the material bearing directly on Ennius, meager enough, certainly, available to Vahlen in 1854. He was further handicapped by the lack of suitable editions of a host of authors with whom his Ennian studies forced him to deal. Since 1854 Vahlen himself has repeatedly written on the fragments of Ennius (see the list on page cxxxvi). In 1884 L. Müller published his *Einleitung in das Studium der römischen Poesie*; in 1885 he brought out his *Q. Ennii Carminum Reliquiae*. Of these works Vahlen has no high opinion, an estimate with which, so far as the treatment of the text is concerned, I have some sympathy; in other respects Vahlen, I think, undervalues Müller's work. In 1897 Ribbeck's book reached a third edition. As the result of these and many other works there was an ever increasing mass of material bearing directly on Ennius; of all this notice is taken, so far as one man could have taken it in one book, in the work before us.

Again, in 1854, as already said, Vahlen had not at his command trustworthy printed editions of books indispensable to the critical student of Ennius.¹ Of great importance, then, for his later work were the labors, after 1854, of divers scholars on the *Grammatici Latini*, Festus, Gellius, Macrobius, Nonius, Servius, etc., aye on the text of Cicero himself.² In 1854 Vahlen carried a heavy burden well-nigh alone; in his advancing years he might have felt that the very subsidia which from one point of view rendered his continuing labors on Ennius easier and his results surer were, by their very multiplicity and complexity, too huge a task for any single man. Yet he persevered and gave us such a presentation of Ennius's life and works, of the part he has played in the intellectual consciousness of the race from his own day to modern times, of the labors of a host of scholars on this striking personality as only one possessed of splendid powers of body and mind alike, of unflagging devotion, of dauntless courage in a huge task could have produced.

Here, surely, is matter to stir the pulse. Again, the reading of Vahlen's account of studies in Ennius by himself and other scholars and of the subsidia of the later book gives one a very real and fascinating history of three score important years in classical scholarship. It is hard to realize to-day how little in some respects the scholars of sixty years ago had at command; Vahlen's narrative brings this home with striking force; it makes us realize, also, how prolific of vital work the last six or seven decades have been.

Finally, Vahlen's narrative helps us to appreciate the importance of work on the fragments of early Latin literature. It is easy to think of such work as unimportant, as inevitably dry-as-dust; yet constructive labors in this field demand, beside other powers, fine imaginative insight controlled by sound logical sense. The work of Ribbeck and Vahlen on the fragments of early Latin made clear the imperative need of authoritative editions of a host of authors who had theretofore lain more or less without the ken of classical scholars. Hence the fruit of Vahlen's labors of a lifetime on Ennius are to be sought not merely in the fine volume before us, but also in the great host of studies on those Latin authors whose names recur so frequently in the testimonia of his Ennius.

¹ See the first edition, vii ff., the later, cxxxvii.

² See the later edition, cxxxviii-cxliii.

Space does not permit me to compare, or rather to contrast, the two editions throughout. To what I have said on this point (page 1) I may add a detail or two. The 332 pages of the first edition have been expanded into 530 larger pages in the second; xciv pages of *Prolegomena* have become ccxxiv; the 238 pages devoted to text and notes, the *Index Verborum*, and two short special *Indexes* have been enlarged to 306 pages of similar matter. The *Prolegomena* of the original book consisted almost wholly of *Quaestiones Ennianae*, in eight chapters, dealing with the contents of the various books and justifying the assignment of fragments to certain places. In the new book the title *Quaestiones Ennianae* is dropped, but the same general matters are treated in Part II of the *Prolegomena*, called *De Libris Ennianis*; a new section entitled *Historia Ennii* is prefixed to this (for its contents see below, pages 5-14). The old book showed the Latin text of the fragments, *testimonia* and notes on the same page; the new book retains this arrangement.

A more detailed statement of the contents of the new edition is as follows: (1) a *Praefatio*, pages iii-ccxxiv; (2) the text of the *Annales*, with full citations of the ancient passages in which the fragments have been preserved, and brief notes, 1-117; (3) the text, etc., of the *Scenica*, 118-203; (4) the text, etc., of the *Saturae*, 204-211; (5) the text, etc., of *Varia* (*Scipio*, *Epigrammata*, *Sota*, *Protrepticus*, *Hedyphagetica*, *Epicharmus*, *Euemerus*), 212-229; (6) text, etc., of *Incerta*, 230-239; (7) *Versus falsi ex Pauli Merulae fontibus ducti*, 240-242; (8) *Index Testium*, 243-256; (9) *Index Sermonis*, 257-299; (10) *Addenda et Corrigenda*, 300-306. There is, however, no *Index Rerum*, a lack to be regretted in view of the wide array of topics covered by the *Praefatio*.¹

The massive *Praefatio* falls into two parts. In one the author

¹ Cross-references, too, are none too plentiful. To be sure the titles at the tops of the pages of the *Praefatio* aid the reader in finding topics, but often cross-references would greatly help the busy student, e. g., on iv to cxcvi-cxcvii; on xii, bottom, to lvi; on xiii (to explain "*suo loco exponam*"); on xvi (to explain "*vidimus victoriam . . . secutum*" and "*plane ut Naevium Cicero testatur*"); on xxi, first line; on xxvii (to explain "*Sed de ea re . . . agetur*"); xxvii (to explain the first full paragraph, end, a reference to page 43 might well be added); so on page 43 a reference back to xxvii would be useful. On lxxxvi we need, surely, a reference to the masterly discussion of Gellius 2. 29 on ccxi ff. I miss the helping references in these and other places all the more because this sort of aid is often given.

aims to give a complete "historiam Ennii ab ipsius initiis usque ad hunc librum editum" (iii); in the other he deals with Ennius's writings. The earlier part occupies pages iii-cxlv and contains, aside from a brief discussion of Ennius's life (iii-xix), an examination or at least a reference to nearly everything worth mentioning that was said about Ennius down to the time of Isidorus. There is also a brief indication of comment on him in the Middle Ages and later. A good bibliography of Ennius could be constructed from these pages. If the book contained nothing but this, its author would have deserved supremely well of Latin literature; it is of immense value, in these crowded days, to have a piece of work done so well and accurately that no one will need to do it again.

Though Vahlen is professedly concerned only with Ennius, there is an array of important observations about many other ancient writers whom he considers in his study of the numerous sources of our knowledge of Ennius. With some, perhaps many, of these observations other scholars will not be in full sympathy, but they will none the less learn much, not only in the domain of fact and inference, but, more important still, in the sphere of method.

Let us analyze now in detail the *Historia Ennii* (iii ff.). At once, after *testimonia de nominibus Ennii* have been cited, we come upon most interesting matter. That Ennius talked of himself in his *Saturae* one fragment at least makes plain. This, cited twice by Nonius from Ennius, *Saturae* III, is thus given by Vahlen on page 205:¹

Enni poeta salve, qui mortalibus
versus propinas flammeos medullitus.

Whether, as Vahlen thinks, some one is (apostrophizing or) addressing the poet, or, as I would suggest as also possible, the poet is apostrophizing himself, we have the poet's personality injected into the *Saturae*.

If the words *numquam poetor nisi <si> podager* (Sat. 64¹), cited by Priscianus merely as from Ennius, are rightly assigned by Vahlen and Müller (73) to the *Saturae*, we have the same phenomenon a second time. On this basis our author writes

¹ So also Müller gives it, *Q. Enni Carminum Reliquiae*, 74 (cited hereafter merely as Müller). Merrill, *Fragments of Roman Satire*, p. 7, prints above this fragment the following words: "A conversation opens between the poet and a reader".

² I cite Ennius normally by Vahlen's titles and verse-numbering.

(iii): "probabile est eum plura de vita sua ac moribus perstrinxisse". Parallel is the famous epitaph said to have been written by Ennius in his old age for his own bust:

Aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam, etc.¹

Next Vahlen cites Gellius's statement (17. 21. 43) that Varro in primo de poetis libro gave the year of Ennius's birth, with the further memorandum that eum (= Ennium), cum septimum et sexagesimum annum haberet, duodecimum Annalem scripsisse idque ipsum Ennium in eodem libro dicere. He thinks that Varro undoubtedly noted what Ennius had said concerning himself in his writings, because (1) Varro was to later writers their chief authority concerning Ennius, (2), according to Gellius, Varro cited concerning Naevius also what Naevius had said about himself.

Now, in 1886, in his Ueber die Annalen des Ennius, 10 ff., Vahlen had held that Annales 12 was largely autobiographical in character and had in consequence assigned to that book, without warranty from ancient testimonia, various extant fragments bearing on Ennius's life and personality. The argument for this procedure is summed up on pages cxcvi-cxcvii of our Praefatio, as follows.

In 6. 1. 23 Macrobius cites the famous

unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem

from Ennius Annales 12 (says Vahlen).² If I understand Vahlen rightly, he lays much stress here on *nobis* as proving that again in Book 12 Ennius was speaking of himself. But two remarks at least are pertinent. First, there is no sure proof that this passage belongs to 12 at all; see below, footnote 2. Secondly, how precarious Vahlen's reasoning is may be seen by considering Vergil's

¹ Vahlen has no doubt, here or on xvii, that Ennius wrote this epitaph. But L. Müller, Philologus 43. 104, refuses to believe that Ennius wrote these verses. In his edition of the fragments (page 153, under testimonium xlvii) he assigns them to Octavius Lampadio or Q. Vargunteius; see further his note on this passage on pages 247-248. Schanz³, too, is sceptical: see viii. 1. 1, page 122 (s. v. Epigramme), and page 112 (under 4). Dougan, on Cicero Tusc. 1. 34, is disinclined to interpret *senis* as denoting actual old age.

² Eyssenhardt (Teubner text, 1868), gives this as from Book 12, after P. Vahlen, page 66, says the Salisb. MS gives vii, not xii. Müller, 36, had put this passage in Book 8.

use of this very passage. In Aeneid 6. 845-846 he makes Anchises say

tu Maximus ille es
unus qui nobis cunctando restituit rem.

Suppose we had of Vergil only fragments: how wide of the mark we should be should we infer that in Aeneid 6 Vergil had written definitely of himself! The *nobis* of the Ennian fragment has no compelling suggestion of the sort Vahlen found in it, admitting that it does indeed belong to Annales 12.

If, then, we would keep our feet on the ground, we have in Gellius alone, if anywhere, categoric proof that Ennius introduced biographical material in Annales 12; Vahlen's 'Combination' is no more successful than such Combinationen are wont to be.¹

Having concluded, however, that in Annales 12 Ennius had written of Fabius and of himself, Vahlen constructs (cxcvii) a theory of the contents of that book which shall explain the incorporation therein of these two themes; he holds that the book was a terminal book, closing one edition of the Annales.² In such a book, indeed, Ennius might have talked at will of himself and of his times, ranging widely over as many years and naming as many heroes as he saw fit.

On the basis of this argument, precarious enough, surely, Vahlen puts in Book 12, beside other things, the following: (1) a verse praising M'. Curius; (2) the famous words in which Ennius compares himself in his old age to a retired race horse;³

¹ Skutsch, 2608, I find, had anticipated my arguments, in part only, however. I find, too, that he had anticipated my own belief that the reading xii in Gellius 17. 21. 43 cannot possibly be right (numerals are notoriously liable to error in our MSS).

² Müller, Quintus Ennius, 128 ff., argued that there were four editions of the Annales, one of six books, one of fifteen, one of sixteen, one of eighteen. Teuffel-Schwabe (I cite Warr's translation, 1891), § 101. 3, had a theory of successive editions ("in series of six respectively of three books [?]", a sentence which is gibberish as it stands: I take it to be meant for "in six series of three books each"), which made 12 a terminal book. Schanz³, VIII. 1. 1, § 117, discusses "Die successive Entstehung der Annalen"; he, too, makes 12 a terminal book, apparently led to do so by Vahlen's arguments. Skutsch 2607, 2610, holds different and safer views.

³ See Cicero Cato Maior 14:

Sicut fortis ecus, spatio qui saepe supremo
vicit Olumpia, nunc senio confectus quiescit.

I have long felt that *quiesco* would be a better reading, better by far; see the

(3) another verse of Ennius about himself,

Nos sumus Romani qui fuimus ante Rudini,

which he had formerly set in Book 18. But none of these passages is assigned by any *ancient* authority to a specific book. In so far as Book 12 contained talk by Ennius about himself, continues Vahlen, it was the prototype of Horace Epp. 1. 20. 19 cum tibi sol tepidus, etc.

All this is wonderfully ingenious, especially the comparison of Book 12 and Horace Epistle 1. 20 (I may add that, were it possible to prove the justice of this comparison, we should have Horace turning in the epilogue of his first book of Epistles to Ennius as his exemplar in expressing his sense of his own achievements exactly as he had done in the epilogue to Carmina I-III). But Vahlen has not demonstrated the truth of his comparison; indeed, in the present state of our knowledge, such proof is impossible.¹

Let us consider the matter further. If we are to find support, with Vahlen and Bailey, for Vahlen's view of Annales 12 in the definite "assignation" (Bailey) of certain fragments to that book (I have already denied that such "assignation" is ancient), what are we to say of the very definite ascription by Gellius 12. 4. 1 ff. to Book VII of the famous passage in which Ennius describes a *quidam amicus Servili*, with the further positive assertion (§ 5) that L. Aelium Stilonem dicere solitum ferunt Q. Ennium de semet ipso haec scripsisse picturamque istam morum et ingenii ipsius Q. Ennii factam esse? We may indeed with Vahlen (p. 43) dismiss Gellius's testimony by saying that it merely shows "quam creduli fuerint aut arguti vel Varronis

context. This emendation must surely have made its way into print somewhere, though I have not seen it mentioned. It had occurred independently, I may add, to my colleague Professor Earle.

¹ Mr. Cyril Bailey, however, in *The Classical Review* 18. 170, is inclined to accept Vahlen's combination. Müller, *Quintus Ennius*, 125, has some sound remarks (unfortunately marred by personalities) on the difficulty of grouping at all the extant verses of the Annales. For some admirable comments on this general subject, with demonstration of the futility of certain efforts of this sort in connection with Greek comedy (the fragments of Cratinus), see pages 32-33 of *Addresses and Essays* by the late Professor Morris Hickey Morgan.

aetate priscorum poetarum interpretes",¹ but such assertion is not proof, and is of a piece with that curious tendency which scholars have long shown to cite Gellius with reverence when he supports their theories and to wave him aside when he is a stumbling block to their combinations. But if Gellius is to be set aside here, then his no more precise or positive statement about Book 12 in 17. 21. 43 must also be discarded and Vahlen's argument about Book 12, so laboriously constructed, is wholly without foundation.

My own view is this. Ennius, a strong and vital personality, a man conscious of his powers and of his mission, given to the expression of his literary self-consciousness, was likely to speak of himself anywhere in his writings, much as two kindred spirits of later times, Lucilius and Horace, more than once spoke of themselves. We have positive evidence, not yet disproved and not to be set aside by any *ipse dixit*, that he did so in two different books of the *Annales*.² Till that evidence is disproved, any attempt to group in a single book any large collection of autobiographical allusions is foredoomed to failure.³

Next Vahlen discusses the year of Ennius's birth (v-vi), the year of his death (vi-vii),⁴ his birthplace (vii-ix). All ancient

¹ Sellar, *Roman Poets of the Republic*, 72-74, Ribbeck, *Römische Dichtung*, 1. 38-39, Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 140, find no trouble in accepting Gellius's statement. Müller, 191, *Quintus Ennius*, 68-70, would not definitely commit himself. Schanz³, VIII. 1. 1, § 36, 2, is sceptical.

² Schanz, page 110 (s. v. *Biographisches*), speaks similarly, though with much less detail.

³ Such an attempt is mistaken, I think, in another way; it involves the assumption, by implication at least, that each book was an artistic whole, from which matter not strictly germane to the theme immediately in hand was excluded. We do not by any means know that such an assumption is well-founded.

⁴ Vahlen makes no comment here or elsewhere (e. g., on page 210) on the *cause* of Ennius's death. Jerome says he died *articulari morbo*. Priscianus cites a verse from Ennius himself (Vahlen, *Sat.* 64) which some regard as bearing on this matter: *Numquam poëtor nisi <si> podager*. By this verse many scholars have been reminded of Horace *Epp.* 1. 19. 7:

Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma
prosiluit dicenda.

Now to me nothing can be clearer than that the Horatian passage as a whole (1-18) is not to be taken too seriously. Schanz, however (p. 110), treats it with desperate seriousness. He regards the famous passage from the *Annales* preserved by Gellius 12. 4 (see above, page 8) as indeed a "Charakterbild"

testimony, right and wrong both, is considered. The implications of the last-named theme, however, are not followed up. Of what nationality was Ennius? What of the bearing of the Greek character of Apulia (Messapia) on Ennius's career? what of the *tria corda* matter, so lightly disposed of on page iv? in what order did Ennius master the three languages he knew and what is the significance of that order? perhaps no positive answer to these questions can be given, but they should at least be asked.¹

Vahlen would like to trace to Ennius himself the story given by Nepos, Cato 1. 4, that Cato as quaestor brought Ennius to Rome from Sardinia; Ennius, he thinks, might have mentioned the fact at the end of *Annales* 12 (as in *Epp.* 1. 20 Horace men-

of Ennius, drawn, however, by Aelius Stilo, not by Ennius himself, as Gellius avers. He then proceeds; "Nur ein Zug ist vergessen, den uns Horaz aufbewahrt hat, dass nämlich Ennius den Becher liebte und denselben gern leerte, ehe er zur Arbeit schritt. Ennius starb im Jahre 169 am Podagra". Müller, too (*Quintus Ennius*, 67), takes Horace literally and traces Ennius's gout to his love of strong drink. So, too, Skutsch, 2592, who suggests that Horace drew his information about Ennius in this connection from Ennius's own *Saturae*. So again Tyrrell, *Anthology of Latin Poetry*, p. 206 (note on xiv, 7); he is similarly over-sober in his *Latin Poetry*, 188, 195. Sellar, *Roman Poets of the Republic*, 72, wrote more wisely of Horace's "humorous exaggeration". So, too, Müller, *Quintus Ennius*, 108, forgetting what he had written on page 67 of the same book, as given already in this note, saw the truth in part, though he mixed absurdity with the truth, in describing Ennius's verse cited above "als eine, natürlich scherzhafte, Entschuldigung, dass der Dichter, auch nachdem er römischer Bürger geworden, doch nicht abstehe Verse zu machen". I note that Ennius, in the verse in question, says nothing himself about drinking. Even in ancient days, we may now believe, gout and high living or much drinking did not necessarily stand in causal sequence. I cannot help wondering that no German scholar has attempted as yet, in the spirit of Leo's efforts to explain away in his *Plautinische Forschungen* the traditional accounts of the lives of Naevius and Plautus as due in part to efforts to gain analogues to traditional accounts of Greek writers, to show that the reference to Ennius's gout by Jerome is based merely on the Horatian passage and this in turn on an importation into Ennius's life of notorious traits of Cratinus, of whom Horace is thinking so much in the whole passage.

¹ For discussions of them see Ribbeck, *Römische Tragödie*, 77; Müller, *Quintus Ennius*, 62; Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 136; Schanz², pp. 109-110, 111 (under *δ*), and, best of all, Skutsch, 2589-2590. I may cite here a remark of Mr. Bailey concerning the book under review (*The Classical Review* 18. 169): "Little will be found in the way of comment on the style and thought or historical accuracy of Ennius; but almost every possible detail, on which such comment may be based".

tioned his own campaigning). But he admits that this is speculation and that there are difficulties in Nepos's story.

On page x Vahlen takes up the ancient tale that Ennius lived on the Aventine, in poverty, with but one ancilla. The story is found only in Jerome, but from Jerome, says Vahlen, we get back to Suetonius, Nepos, Cicero, Varro, and thence to autobiographical matter by Ennius himself (though for autobiographical matter on this point, whose existence is hinted at rather than asserted, no evidence at all is given, aside from a reiteration of the belief (see above, p. 6) that Varro was familiar with all the autobiographical matter in Ennius). If now, he continues, we recall what Festus says (492. 22 Th.) about the grant of the aedes Minervae as a meeting place for *scribae* and *histriones*, we understand why tradition made Ennius live on the Aventine. Jerome's story Vahlen refers to Ennius's early years in Rome, when he gained his living by teaching.¹ He remembers that Cicero says in Cato Maior 14 that Ennius was poor in his old age, but, following again his more or less eclectic policy with respect to the sources, he is disinclined to accept Cicero's testimony. The tradition about the ancilla he traces to the story in Cicero De Oratore 2. 276 concerning Nasica, Ennius and an ancilla; the story may have been told, he thinks, by Ennius himself "in satura aut nescio quo carmine". Having but one slave (or but few slaves), he says, was a "vulgare indicium paupertatis"; he compares Seneca ad Helviam 12. 4 unum fuisse Homero servum, tres Platoni, nullum Zenoni satis constat, and Terence Haut. 293.²

¹ So Schanz, p. 110; cf. Skutsch, 2590.

² I may add Horace Serm. 1. 3. 11-12 (about Hermogenes Tigellius) and Serm. 1. 6. 116 (about himself). In 1895 Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, 67, anticipated part of Vahlen's present criticism of this story. Schanz, § 36, 7, is not convinced by Leo and Vahlen. I may note that there is nothing whatever in Cicero De Oratore 2. 276 to show that Ennius was then poor; not more than one ancilla could well have figured in such a tale, however many slaves Ennius might have had. The argument from Festus's reference to the aedes Minervae is inconclusive; we might fairly urge that one seeking to live by literature at all would naturally fix his abode in the vicinity of the meeting place of the poets. Schanz, too, § 36, 7, doubts the statement in Cicero Cato Maior 14; I need not say, however, that poverty in old age is not incompatible with happier circumstances in earlier days. Ennius outlived his friend Scipio by many years, as Vahlen notes in another connection. If Ennius was poor at any time during his life at Rome, it was, I think, either in

Next Ennius's friendship with Scipio is considered (xii-xiii). Then Vahlen notes that, though Ennius praises Cato, he cannot have been intimate with the censor (in spite of Cicero Cato Maior 10); they were too much unlike and Cato was the enemy of Ennius's friend Scipio. He thinks, further, that Cato's criticism of Fulvius because he took Ennius with him on his campaign to Aetolia is evidence that Cato was not especially friendly, to say the least, to Ennius. But this inference is not inevitable; it is likely enough that Cato's game was Fulvius rather than Ennius (cf. Cicero Tusc. 1. 2). Cato's criticism of Fulvius, continues Vahlen, proves that Ennius did not go with Fulvius to fight, for to that Cato could not have taken exception. Hence, in using *militarat*, in Brutus 79, of Ennius's activities in Aetolia, Cicero was much less exact than he was in Pro Archia 11 about Archias (xix, note 2).¹ Finally, Vahlen approves Ribbeck's suggestion that Ennius's Ambracia dealt with the capture of the city of that name by Fulvius, though, he admits, nothing in the few fragments of the piece proves this. He does not notice Müller's suggestion (Quintus Ennius, 61; cf. Mommsen, R. G. 1⁸. 801) that Ennius took the praenomen Quintus to please the son of Fulvius, to whom he owed citizenship.

Our author holds (xvi) that Ennius spent all his years at Rome in writing. We can seldom tell, however, in what order he produced his works. The Scipio, it is reasonable to suppose, came shortly after the battle of Zama;² so the Ambracia would have come most fittingly immediately after Fulvius's triumph in 187. According to Varro ap. Gell. 17. 21. 43 Ennius was writing Annales 12 in 172.³ From all this Vahlen concluded in 1886

his first days there, before he had won powerful patrons, or in his last days, when those patrons were dead. (Professor Sihler, in his paper on The Collegium Poetarum at Rome, A. J. P. XXVI 4 ff., emphasizes the poverty of poetae and scribae). From the fact that Ennius got citizenship from the son of Fulvius, one may, perhaps, conclude that Ennius outlived another patron of his middle life, the elder Fulvius. Skutsch, 2590, thinks these stories of Ennius's poverty may well go back to autobiographical passages in Ennius's writings.

¹ Aurelius Victor De Vir. Ill. 52 was much more exact. On the general points involved see Müller, Quintus Ennius, 66; Schanz, p. 110; Skutsch 2591. I may add that at the time of Fulvius's campaign Ennius was fifty years old, and so beyond the normal fighting age.

² Skutsch, 2599, is less precise; he merely says the Scipio must have preceded the Annales.

³ But see above, page 7, especially note 1.

that Ennius did not begin his *Annales* till 184, and that he was busy on them till he died (as Naevius wrote his *Bellum Punicum* in his old age: Cicero *Cato Maior* 50). Vahlen adds now that in *Annales* IX Ennius praises the Consul Cethegus in terms which imply that Cethegus belonged to a period earlier by twenty-five years, more or less, than the time of writing. Cethegus was consul in 194. It may perhaps be captious to note that twenty-five years would bring Book 9 down to 169, a period three years later than that so often insisted on by our author for Book 12. In Book 12, continues Vahlen, Ennius confesses that he is old; again, in the first line of his famous epitaph, which contains a direct reference to the *Annales*, he describes himself as *senex*. I fail to see the force of this last point. If we accept the epitaph as by Ennius himself (see above, page 6, note 1), it still need not *per se* prove at all that the *Annales* and the epitaph were contemporaneous. In writing his epitaph in advanced age a man might look back over many years to work done long before.

Before 184, says Vahlen, Ennius devoted himself to play writing, because thus he could most readily have earned a living. Here several things, it seems to me, are ignored. What of the evidence that Ennius was a teacher? When was this teaching done? It is surely not likely to have been done after he became a figure of consequence in the national literature. Further, was there really a good chance of supporting one's self by writing plays?¹ Not many plays, surely, can have been brought out by one man in any one year (the days of the *ludi* were not so numerous in Ennius's time); the stress laid on the sum, small enough in itself, won by Terence through his *Eunuchus* shows that the normal payments to playwrights cannot have been large. Still, as Ribbeck notes in his *Römische Tragödie*, 78, the years following the close of the Second Punic War were very favorable to the drama. We may note also that Livius Andronicus's first play(s) followed the close of the First Punic War, and that the statement commonly made that concentric sets of seats (*gradus*) in the theater date from 146 B. C. rests on no better foundation than the inference that the period of rejoicing over the fall of Corinth and Carthage would naturally have set up conditions equally or even more favorable to the production of plays.

¹ I admit that similar queries may well be put concerning the possibility of supporting one's self by teaching in Ennius's time.

Finally, although Ennius never stopped writing plays (witness his *Thyestes* in his last year), Vahlen thinks he produced most of his dramas before he began to write the *Annales*.

On pages xviii–xix Vahlen rejects the ancient story, found in varying forms in several writers, that the bust of Ennius stood on Scipio's tomb, by the latter's orders. He rejects it on the grounds, first, that the authors who first mention it do not speak categorically (cf. *putatur* in Cicero *Pro Archia* 22, and *dicuntur* in Livy 38. 56. 4), and, secondly, that Ennius died some eighteen years after Scipio.¹ The latter argument is inconclusive. Scipio, not being able to foresee how long Ennius would outlive him, might well enough (why may not the reviewer too indulge in speculation?) have asked that some memorial of his friendship with Ennius be placed on his tomb; it is not too hard to believe that even eighteen years after his death his wish—had he expressed such a wish—still carried weight with his family, a family rather tenacious of memories and customs. However, Vahlen thinks that the whole tale arose merely from the fact that Ennius was a contemporary of Scipio and had praised him; he believes rather, on the basis of a different story in Jerome, that Ennius's body was burned on the Janiculum and that his bones were sent to Rudiae. On these same pages reference is made to the intimacy of Ennius and Caecilius.

Here ends the *Vita Enni*.

Vahlen turns now to consider in great detail the attitude of other writers toward Ennius. How far do other writers cite him? In what way do they cite him? What is the value of their citations? What light do they throw on the esteem in which Ennius was held? How far do they help us to reconstruct his works or to form a conception of their arguments? These and allied questions Vahlen has ever in mind (xix–cxxxi).²

It is probable, he thinks, that Ennius knew neither Livius Andronicus nor Naevius (xix–xx). There is no sure evidence that Livius was alive after 207, the year of his poem in honor of Juno; Naevius lived on after 204, but away from Rome. Years after Naevius's death, when Ennius had got round to describing the First Punic War, he wrote harshly of Naevius, to the wrath of Cicero (*Brutus* 75), but he had then an axe to grind, in that he was seeking to show the vast distance between the rude Satur-

¹ Cf. Skutsch, 2590–2591.

² Cf. Skutsch, 2613 ff.

nians of Livius and Naevius and his own hexameters,¹ at once more ambitious in effort and more polished in fact.

Cicero, l. c., charges that Ennius after all borrowed from Naevius. The fragments show no clear light on this point. We must, however, bear in mind (xx) that both Naevius and Ennius began with Aeneas and that Ennius treated this part of his theme "non parce"; certain things (see Vahlen on Ann. 35-51, in the testimonia) make it likely that, had we both poets com-

¹ I insert here a note I have long had in mind to write. Ribbeck, *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*², p. 5, gives at the end of his collection of the fragments of Livius Andronicus four verses which Terentianus Maurus cites as from Livius ille vetus Graio cognomine. Of these verses the first and the third are hexameters, the second and the fourth *miuri*. Marius Victorinus supports Terentianus. In his edition of the *Fragmenta* Ribbeck does not seem to doubt this testimony. In his comments on the lines he does indeed say, as his last word, this: "Laevio tribuit Scaliger: cf. mea hist. trag. Rom., p. 34 adn."; but the footnote in question contains no reference to Scaliger. In his *Römische Tragödie*, page 34, text, he discusses our verses in his treatment of Livius Andronicus; here there are notes of scepticism, as follows: "Auch die Ino des Livius Andronicus, wenn es ein solches Stück gab, muss diesen Stoff behandelt haben". In a footnote to the clause I have italicized, Ribbeck holds that we must forever remain uncertain on that point because Laevius too wrote an Ino. To this he adds nothing beyond the statement that the verses under discussion are "in offenbar modernisirter Form". Teuffel (§§ 13. 5; 94. 5) and Cruttwell (p. 38) believed unreservedly that Andronicus wrote these lines.

It has long seemed to me, independently of the attitude of others, that these lines have the appearance of being late productions. It is hard to believe that Livius could have produced verses as smooth as these or indeed that he attempted such a metrical tour de force at all. All the arguments by various scholars to the effect that the acrostic *argumenta* to the plays of Plautus must, on grounds of form alone, be assigned to a relatively late and sophisticated age apply, mutandis mutatis, to our verses.

Now, a poet Laevius flourished about 64 B. C. He is constantly confounded by the ancients "with Livius, Naevius, Lepidus, Laevinus, even with Pacuvius" (Teuffel, § 150. 4; Schanz, VIII. 1. 2, § 91). It is known that this Laevius used a wide variety of meters, among which Teuffel, l. c., names iambic dimeters, trochaics, scazons, anapaests, hexameters, phalaeicians, etc. (cf. Schanz, l. c., p. 34). It would appear, also, that he wrote a work called Ino. It seems to me altogether probable that the verses in Ribbeck, cited as from an Ino of Livius, are to be ascribed rather to Laevius. I may add that *odorisequus*, found in the fourth of the verses under discussion, is precisely the sort of compound that Laevius affected (see Gellius 19. 7. 2 ff.; Schanz, p. 37). No marked compounds occur in indisputable fragments of Livius.

I find now that others have lately questioned the Livian authorship of these verses; see Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 125, n. 2.

plete, we should find more evidence of borrowing by the later writer. I may add that everything we know about the methods of work of Latin writers lends credibility to any statement made in ancient times that Ennius borrowed, where opportunity offered, from his predecessor.

Plautus and Ennius lived in Rome contemporaneously for over twenty years. Yet of their relations nothing is known. The Prologue of the *Poenulus* does indeed contain a reference to the Achilles Aristarchi (of Ennius), but that gives no hint of personal relations between the two men, even if this prologue is really Plautine.¹ One thing the allusion does prove; by the time this prologue was written Ennius's fame was secure: the spectators know whose play is meant, though the author is not named. Vahlen believes that he detects certain similarities in language between Plautus and Ennius (xxi, bottom)².

¹On this point Vahlen has no doubts (cf. xxi: "Plautinum enim hunc prologum esse non est quod dubitetur"); Plautine scholars, however, have held on various grounds doubts of its authenticity, at least in part: cf. e. g., Palmer, *Amphitruo*, pp. 127-128 (by implication, in what is said about fixed seats in the theater), Morris on *Captivi* 68, p. 8, and in particular Ritschl, *Parerga* 219-220, 225. I feel sorry to be obliged to record that Vahlen's pronouncements on moot matters outside of problems connected with Ennius are more than once mere obiter dicta, beset by the fatality which so often overwhelms the obiter dicta of the bench. See below, p. 23, n. 2. Still more striking is the way in which in two lines (ccxiv) he disposes of the dramatic *Satura*; see my comments in *A. J. P.* XXIX 468-469.

²Vahlen adds: "nec dubito quin aliorum diligentia plura inventura sit, sed ne ea quidem est quod alterum sumpsisse ab altero quam utrumque ex communi sermonis usu prompsisse malimus". Certainly the similarities noted by Vahlen himself are, as he admits, without significance.

I hope that an investigation which I have on hand at present, involving a search for References to Painting and Literature in Plautus and Terence, will throw brighter light on this subject. For the present I content myself with asking the reader to compare that most brilliant of all the parodies in Plautus, *Bacchides* 925-978, with Ennius *Scen.* 92 ff.; especially let him put Plautus 933

O Troia, o patria, o Pergamum, o Priame periisti senex

side by side with Ennius 92 ff.:

O pater, o patria, o Priami domus, etc.

My investigation will show clearly, I can see already, that Plautus knew contemporary and earlier tragedy well, and that he girds at it from time to time; he can hardly have left Ennius, the most successful writer of tragedy thus far, out of his ken. See *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 41.

Caecilius and Ennius were intimates (xvii, xviii). Pacuvius, says Vahlen (xxii-xxiii), for many years "*picturam exercuit*"; he was *persenex* when he began to compose tragedies. Having cited the well-known verses,

Pacvi discipulus dicor, porro is fuit Enni,
Ennius Musarum, Pompilius clueor,

Vahlen writes thus (xxiv): "Sed is qui se Pacuvii (*Pacvi*) discipulum dicit, si Pacuvium Ennii discipulum voluit ea mente qua Ennium Musarum, non est profecto quod Pacuvium vivo Ennio et eo docente tragicam artem didicisse statuamus". This, I confess, I do not understand. He notes further that in later days Pacuvius was believed to have outshone Ennius, "*nec solum in tragoedia*". He proceeds immediately to cite allusions to Pacuvius's *Saturae*; the juxtaposition seems to imply that he would have us feel that Pacuvius surpassed Ennius in this field too. But the references cited by him surely give no color at all to such a view. Nor is the view favored by the fact that Pacuvius's *Saturae* have completely disappeared.

Of writers who were not Ennius's contemporaries Terence is the first to mention him; in *Andria* 18 ff. he names Ennius as one of those whose use of *contaminatio* justified his own practice in that regard. The circumstances under which Terence wrote this passage preclude the possibility of doubting his testimony. Yet, Vahlen maintains (xxiv), in the extant fragments of Ennius there is no hint of *contaminatio*. The claim made by some that there are traces of contamination in the *Iphigenia* Vahlen refuses to admit.¹

It is seldom that Terence seems to have Ennius in mind, says

¹I note that, in spite of Terence's own admission that he contaminated, modern scholarship has failed to add evidences of this process from his *complete* plays. This, let me remark in passing, is the finest possible tribute to his consummate art. The absence of any real evidence of contamination in Ennius's *fragments* was to be expected, in view of the nature of the fragments, the mode of their preservation, and the fact that they were cited by ancient writers commonly to prove isolated points, not to throw general light on Ennius's writings in the large. The whole matter may serve once again to warn us how hesitant we should be to make general declarations concerning a writer on the basis of fragments only of his work. See above, p. 8, n. 1.

Vahlen. He asks us, however, to compare Syrus's words in *Adelphoe* 386 ff.

istuc est sapere, non quod ante pedes modost
videre, sed etiam illa quae futura sunt
prospicere,

with a verse in the *Iphigenia* (Scen. 244):

Quod est ante pedes nemo spectat, caeli scrutantur plagas.

He notes that Donatus ad loc. declares that hoc sumpsit poeta de illo in physicum pervulgato ancillae dicto, and then cites the Ennius verse. I would suggest that perhaps rather both authors are drawing on a proverbial expression, similar in spirit to the parable of the mote and the beam. Again, in *Eunuchus* 590

At quem deum! qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit!

Donatus saw *parodia* de Ennio; in Scen. 380 we have

qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit.

In his *Praefatio* xxiv Vahlen thinks that "Terentius . . . hunc versum ita affert . . . ut se uti alieno versu indicare videatur" (something I myself quite fail to see); in the *testimonium* to Ennius's verse, however (p. 192), he says "Ennii versus fueritne talis qualem Terentius posuit dubium reddit Donati adnotatio". But it was natural for poet after poet to refer to Jupiter's thunder, and it would have been difficult to make the references much unlike. Finally, says our author, *Phormio* 339-340 is surely an imitation of the six verses which he has included, though very doubtfully, in the fragments of the *Saturae* (Book 6, vss. 14-19).¹

Vahlen writes next of Vargunteius's efforts to make Ennius's *Annales* better known by reading them publicly *certis diebus*, and then quotes (xxvi) Fronto's statement that L. Caelius Antipater <Ennium> aemulatus est. From this he infers (1) that Caelius read Ennius diligently, and (2) that since Cicero declares (*De Legg.* 1. 6, *De Orat.* 2. 54) that Caelius paid some heed to

¹ The investigation referred to above, on page 16, n. 2, has already shown clearly that Terence offers far less material in that connection than Plautus; we may feel certain that his consummate sense of art prevented him from introducing matter which might seem extraneous. I may refer to my observations on the care with which Terence confines his geographical references to strictly Greek geography, made in my paper on *Travel in Ancient Times* as seen in Plautus and Terence, *Classical Philology*, 2. 5, n. 2.

style, "in ea re ad Ennii exemplum se composuisse". Yet, he argues, we must not read too much into Fronto's utterance; he is thinking primarily of the right choice of words.¹ Hence Vahlen differs from those who, because Livy used Caelius as one of his authorities for the Hannibalic War, whenever they see in Livy "colore quodam poetico distincta", ascribe these things at once to Caelius, as imitator Ennii, and feel that in this way they are increasing our store of fragments of Ennius.²

I must pass over Vahlen's discussion of the relation of Aelius Stilo (xxvii), Lucilius (xxvii ff.), and Lucretius (xxx) to Ennius. We turn rather to two men, contemporaries, who have done most to preserve Ennius's verses, Varro and Cicero.

Varro couples Ennius and Homer more than once; he refers to Ennius even in his *De Re Rustica*. In his *Saturae* he cited him, probably, not seldom (xxxi), a significant fact, because Varro wished his *Saturae* to be generally used; his citation of Ennius's verses without indication of authorship proves how well and widely Ennius's writings were known. A richer source, however, of verses of Ennius is the *De Lingua Latina*, especially Books 5-7, which deal with *usus sermonis*; even more fruitful is Book 8, which sets forth "propria poetarum in significandis locis ac temporibus consuetudo". But helpful as Varro is, he has his defects; he does not cite exactly with the name of the work and the number of the book whence the fragment comes; he writes rather as "homo doctus . . . doctis hominibus ex immensa copia eruditionis semper affluentis" (xxxii). Again, at times at least he is not verbally accurate (we can check some of his citations by appeal to works surviving intact). So, then, he never names the *Annales*; of course he never ascribes a fragment to a specific book of the *Annales*. The tragedies he does at times name (xxxi, xxxiv); sometimes he cites, not a play, but the name of a character in a play (xxxv). All this renders it extremely difficult to assign to their proper places the fragments of Ennius preserved for us by Varro.

Cicero (xxxix ff.) "singulari favore prosecutus est Ennium, cuius memoria dici non potest quantum debeat Ciceroni". To

¹ In a footnote Vahlen declares that he fails to find resemblances between the fragments of Caelius and those of Ennius. Cf. Skutsch, 2618.

² Vahlen declares he will discuss this point later when he comes to Livy. I shall merely say, therefore, here that I agree heartily with his position. See below, page 24.

him (and, I may add, to Gellius) we owe the long continuous passages. Again, Cicero's quotations deal mainly with matters and thoughts, not with syllables and forms; thus he indicates the connection, the context of the passages he cites, helping us to get an idea often of the argument, and, in the case of plays, even of the action.

Now, says Vahlen, Cicero was an orator heard by many, a writer who desired to be read by many. Hence his citations of Ennius prove that Ennius was a popular poet (his tragedies, we may remember, were still often seen in Cicero's time: xlix); he was reminding "*homines liberaliter instituti*" of facts and thoughts perfectly familiar to them from their own reading and from their own witnessing of plays.

Turning now to details Vahlen notes that there are not many citations from Ennius in Cicero's Orations. At once I pause to ask how this fact fits in with Vahlen's contention, just set forth, that Ennius was a well-known, much read and popular poet. There are indeed, as Vahlen reminds us, notable references to Ennius in the *Pro Archia* (xxxix-xl). But the *Pro Archia*, I would ask the reader to remember, was unique; it was addressed, not to the many, but to a small group of iudices, picked men, with a presiding officer whose culture is dwelt upon; yet even to these men Cicero is apologetic throughout with respect to culture and pure literature. We may recall with profit the fact that Cicero adopts varying tones about certain subjects, according as he talks to the populace in the open air or to the few in the Senate. In *Pro Murena* 30 he refers to Ennius, without naming him; but here again, I ask the reader to note, he is addressing a jury. Again, here, as elsewhere, Cicero converts to his own uses what Ennius had said, "*ut appareat quantum Cicero ab auditorum intelligentia exspectaret*" (xli). An examination of the *Index Testium* on pages 244 ff. fails to show any citations by Cicero from Ennius in the *Catiline Orations* or in the *Manilian Law*, orations specifically addressed to the people. We may surmise, also, that on the whole some citations from the poets in Orations were added in that revision which, as we know, Cicero gave to his speeches before they were published. It would seem to me, then, that so far as citations from Ennius in the Orations go, they prove clearly that Cicero himself knew Ennius well and that in his opinion the sort of men who served as iudices also knew the poet, but they do not prove that Ennius was known to the many.

Of Cicero's rhetorical writings the *De Oratore*—the most elaborate of them all, I may note—shows many citations from Ennius, especially in Book 3. The plan of the work makes these in general short pieces; Cicero takes for granted his reader's knowledge of the rest (xlii–xliii). Similar are the citations in the *Orator*; there are also here some general judgments of the poet, and a comparison of him with Homer. The *Brutus* gives us important *fragmenta Enniana*. All this rather confirms, I think, what I said above about the absence of citations from Ennius in the *Orations*; when Cicero is writing elaborately, to the few who have leisure to *read* as often as they will what he has said, his citations are far more numerous than they are when he is talking to the populace which must take in at a single hearing all that the orator says.¹

The philosophical works give us “*immensa copia . . . testimoniorum*” (xlvi ff.). The *Annales* Cicero very seldom names, “*quotquot versus citavit qui non possunt nisi in Annalibus locum habuisse*”. He names Ennius, occasionally the character whom the poet had represented as speaking, sometimes verses alone without name of poet or work, “*tamen non dubius haec recte ab iis quibus vult intelligi*”. “*Poetam appellat, nusquam poema, sed loquitur ut de re nota decerptis admonendi causa paucis particulis versuum ne inter se quidem connexorum*” (xlvii).²

Cicero's philosophical works, without exception, yield fragments of Ennius, but the *Tusculans* contribute most; in the *Tusculans*, by the way, he justifies, by contemporary Greek usage, the introduction of verses into philosophical discussions. These citations come particularly from the tragedies; for a list of tragedies cited by Cicero see page 1.³ Many verses, plainly tragic, are quoted without assignment to definite plays. But, says Vahlen, it was not necessary for him to name the plays “*quas nemo erat quin de scena cognitas haberet*”. He often names

¹ Nettleship, *Lectures and Essays*, Second Series, 105, 109, has well pointed out how the fact that Caesar and Cicero both were at bottom orators by training, seeking to convey instantaneously their message to people's *ears*, accounts for certain characteristics of their style, e. g., the fact that their periods are far less intricate than those of Livy, who wrote for readers.

² The longest surviving fragments of the *Annales* we owe to *De Divinatione* I; both are cited merely as *apud Ennium*.

³ Holden, in his note on Cicero *De Officiis* I. 114 (l. 15), had given a good list of tragedies of Ennius cited by Cicero.

rather the character whose words he is quoting. Again, he does not always quote the exact words (l, liii).¹

In Cicero's Epistles there is little of Ennius, though he is once named, "sed quae sunt aperiunt quam familiaris fuerit Ciceroni

¹ Pages xlviii–xlix bring up a matter which has long interested me. Two passages are cited there, one from *De Finibus* 1. 4, the other from *Academica* 1. 10, in which Cicero expresses somewhat different ideas concerning the way in which Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius rendered their Greek originals. In the former he implies that they wrote *fabellas ad verbum e Graecis expressas*, in the latter he says they *non verba sed vim Graecorum expresserunt poetarum*.

Vahlen does not discuss these passages. I cannot refrain from setting forth my own opinion that a comparison of the fragments of Ennius, at least, with their Greek originals, will show that Cicero's words in the *Academica* are much nearer the truth. The matter is no mere academic question; a man's attitude toward it may affect deeply his view of certain very important questions. For example, Professor M. L. Earle, in an article entitled *Studies in Sophocles's Trachinians* (*Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 33. 21–29), considered at length Cicero's translation in *Tusc.* 2. 20–22 of Sophocles's *Trachinians* 1046–1102. Professor Earle throughout tacitly assumes that Cicero was seeking to translate as literally as possible (as literally as his knowledge of Greek made possible), and so sought to determine the probable Greek original of Cicero's rendering and compared or contrasted the readings thus inferred with the *textus receptus* of Sophocles. This procedure was, to my mind, quite unjustifiable. The theory that Cicero was trying to translate as closely as possible is not the only conceivable explanation of the differences between the Latin version and the Greek original; those differences can be explained perfectly well on another theory, to wit, that Cicero was, in the language of the *Academica*, seeking to express *non verba sed vis Sophoclis*. The latter theory, in itself more natural, is made far more probable when we recall, what Professor Earle does not note at all as a factor in the problem, that Cicero was translating iambic trimeters in one language into iambic senarii in another quite different language. No one would hold Professor Earle's attitude in connection with an English hexameter translation, say, of the *Aeneid*.

I am myself thoroughly convinced that the *Academica* passage gives the truth; in *De Finibus*, l. c., Cicero held a brief, with himself as client, beset by a charge to which he was always extremely sensitive (see Dr. Reid's admirable discussion of Cicero as Man of Letters and Student of Philosophy, in his larger edition of the *Academica*, pages 1–10).

In the case of Ennius, to apply to our general subject the foregoing remarks, there is clear proof that, though he often enough misunderstood the Greek (but have not far more learned Greek scholars since his day, with far better subsidia at their command, done this?), he often departed deliberately from his originals. I cite at present but one authority—a disinterested one—on this point; see Mackail's remarks in his *Latin Literature*, p. 8, on Ennius's *Iphigenia at Aulis*.

Ennii poesis et quam non ignota iis ad quos scribit. Utitur enim Ennianis ut suae orationi leporis aliquid et facetiarum impertiat, quod placere possit iis quibuscum communicat" (liv). I note once again, however, that Cicero's correspondents were, in general, men who stood out from the common throng.

We have come by this time to the Augustan Age (lv ff.). In the last half century B. C. Ennius was less highly esteemed than he had been by Cicero. Still, Augustus, in a letter to Tiberius (Suet. Tib. 21; see Vahlen lvi), applied to Tiberius, in slightly modified form, a famous verse of Ennius, writing:

Unus homo nobis vigilando restituit rem.

Vergil¹ was deeply indebted to Ennius, if Macrobius and Servius are to be believed (see below, pages 32-34). Horace's pronouncements on Ennius vary; in at least one place, however (Serm. 1. 4. 60 ff.), he speaks of him with marked respect.² Occasionally, says Vahlen, we can see traces of Ennius's verses in Horace. Still, of infelicities in Ennius Horace speaks in Serm. 1. 10. 57 ff.³ In Horace's time the battle between the advocates of the older and those of the newer literature was on⁴; the extravagant praise bestowed by some on Ennius Horace vigorously opposed in Epp. 2. 1. 50 ff. But this very passage and *Ars Poetica* 258 testify to Ennius's vogue; the latter also proves that Ennius's tragedies were still seen on the stage.

On page lx there is a brief treatment of Ovid's attitude toward Ennius; though he criticises the older poet as lacking in art, he none the less testifies to his vogue. Then, in a very interesting

¹Skutsch, 2616, emphasizing the extent to which Vergil imitated Ennius, holds that precisely this fact, in view of the success of the *Aeneid*, "am meisten dazu beigetragen hat, dass die Nachfolgenden <i. e., the literary artists of the later time> mehr und mehr Geschmack und Interesse an E. verloren".

²Vahlen cites also *Carm.* 4. 8. 17-20, as evidence of Horace's respect for Ennius. Neither here nor on page xii, where he had already cited these verses, does he give any hint that he questions the authenticity of this Ode in whole or in part. See above, p. 16, n. 1.

³Animadversion upon Ennius's infelicities and reproduction of some of his phrases or verses are of course not incompatible. If we need proof on this point, we may recall that, spite of his words in *Serm.* 1. 10. 16-19, Horace did reproduce bits of Catullus.

⁴See also my paper on Archaism in Aulus Gellius, in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler*, 135.

part of the Praefatio (lxi ff.), Vahlen considers the relation of Livy to Ennius. Interwoven with this discussion is a further treatment of Ovid's relation to our poet. These themes Vahlen interlaces "ob necessitatem quam ambo (i. e. Livy and Ovid) cum Ennio habuisse creduntur".

Livy¹ mentions Ennius but twice. In 38. 56. 4 he refers to the statue in Scipionum monumento said to have been that of the poet. In 30. 26. 9, in relating the death of Q. Fabius Maximus, he says of him, nihil certius est quam unum hominem nobis cunctando rem restituisse, sicut Ennius ait. As Vahlen notes, the well-known verse Livy need not have derived directly from the Annales, particularly since "eum solutis numeris affert".

Verses of Ennius Livy does at times adapt to his own purposes. But Vahlen refuses to follow those who see (as Hug saw) whole verses transplanted bodily by Livy into his own work. Livy knew too well, says Vahlen, the dicta of the rhetoricians—e. g. Cicero—against the presence of complete verses in prose writings.²

Nor will Vahlen accept Ehwald's view that "vestigia quaedam non solum orationis sed etiam metrorum Ennianorum" are to be discovered in Livy. Ehwald compared certain verses in Ovid de excessu Romuli with utterances of Livy on the same theme, found them, he maintained, alike, and concluded that the likeness meant that both authors had imitated Ennius (lxii).

By another path scholars have sought to find vestigia Enniana in Livy, ascribing to Ennius's influence "quae numerosi quid habent aut colore poetico distincta sunt". Caelius Antipater, according to Cicero, had paid some heed to style (see above, page 18); hence these critics have held that passages in Livy that are rhythmical or poetic in coloring come ultimately from Ennius, not directly, but through Caelius. Indeed, cries Vahlen, to hear these critics talk, one would almost fancy that Caelius had written of the Hannibalic War in verse! (lxiii).

Now, if Livy did not use Caelius as his sole authority—and we know he did not—why should we ascribe to Caelius alone "quaecumque numerosi quid habere viderentur in his libris Livianis"?

¹See Skutsch, 2618.

²Yet there are verses and parts of verses in Livy, verses consciously made or unconsciously allowed by him, a thing worse than an intentional quotation or unconscious reminiscence.

All this leads Vahlen naturally to consider (lxiv) certain views put forth by Wölfflin (Rh. Mus. 50 (1895). 152) and the latter's pupil, Mr. S. G. Stacey (Archiv 10. 17 ff.). Wölfflin, he says, "non sanae cupiditati versus Ennii ex Livio recuperandi sua auctoritate novum fervorem addidit"; struck by the non-prose word-order in Livy 9. 41. 18 et sicubi est certamen, scutis magis quam gladiis geritur res, and remembering that Ennius had written

pellitur e medio sapientia, vi geritur res,

he concluded that Livy had derived a fragment of a hexameter (*geritur res*) from Ennius.

To this Vahlen objects as follows: (1) if we pronounce rightly (*géritur rés*), we have no dactylic swing at all; (2) there are many parallels in Livy to the word-order which caught Wölfflin's eye; indeed, the postposition of *res* is a Livian fad.

Wölfflin's view was adopted and expanded by his pupil, Mr. Stacey (lxiv). In his doctoral dissertation Mr. Stacey laid stress on the "Livianae orationis poeticus color"; finding a certain mode of expression both in Livy and in the fragments of Ennius, or in Livy and in some of the other poets, especially Vergil (imitator Ennianus), he held that these modes of expression were originated by Ennius. Such argument, says Vahlen, is fallacious. We need first of all, he continues, to compare Livy with Livy himself, with the utmost care and acumen; only thus shall we be able to determine just what is Livian, just what is foreign to his style (the brief discussion above of the erroneous stress laid by Wölfflin on the occurrence of *geritur res* as a terminal phrase in Livy will show what Vahlen means here). Again, to infer from two known facts a third *unknown* fact or idea is a procedure which is "seminator . . . multorum inanum et incredibilium": why, pray, does it follow that, merely because Livy and Vergil have a given expression, both derived it from Ennius? ¹

¹ I fear that Vahlen is here not quite just. Wölfflin and Stacey remind us carefully of Vergil's indebtedness to Ennius; this makes their line of study far less palpably absurd than Vahlen represents it to be. It happens that the year which saw the publication of the book under review witnessed the issuance by the same publishers of Norden's monumental edition of Aeneid VI. Norden was strongly disposed to accept the views of Wölfflin and Stacey; he repeatedly mentions Mr. Stacey's paper with commendation. In my review of Norden's book (A. J. P. XXVII 71-83) I discussed this whole matter (pages 76-77). I was at that time not familiar with Vahlen's views,

Verrius Flaccus's relation to Ennius is now considered (lxv ff.). He "non exiguam partem Ennii carminibus tribuit". To dogmatize here is difficult, since we have to deal now, not with Verrius's work itself, but with epitomes of it made by two men living in widely sundered periods. Yet Vahlen is convinced that Verrius read and excerpted Ennius for himself. To Festus go back many verses of the *Annales* and of some tragedies (lxvi). The *Annales* are cited by books, and always—save once—in the order of the books¹ (cf. e. g., 172. 1 Ennius libro VI . . . et libro XVI; 194. 14 Ennius in libro II . . . ; item in libro V . . . ; item in libro VIII. The exception is 220. 25 Ennius libro XVI . . . et in libro VIII).² We may assume, says Vahlen, that Verrius himself had cited the *Annales* in this way.

Further, in Festus the tragedies are cited by their *names*, after the *Annales*, but in no settled order. Only twelve or thirteen in all are cited; the total number of quotations is not large. Again, whether he quotes from the *Annales* or from the plays, Festus usually cites "singulos versus . . . , plenos illos quidem numeris, sed sententia saepe non absoluta" (lxvii); fifty times, more or less, he quotes thus from the *Annales*. Often what he quotes is but a dependent clause. His method of quotation from the tragedies is the same (lxix). Yet, complains Vahlen, rightly, such passages have been repeatedly 'emended', with consequent misinterpretation.³

as outlined above. But a careful consideration of the points at issue had left me decidedly sceptical, on grounds differing from those advanced by Vahlen. Skutsch, 2616, however, is much impressed by Norden's efforts to extract fresh bits of Ennius from Vergil (he does not mention Wölfflin or Stacey). But his enthusiasm here is in large degree nullified (though he does not realize this) by a remark made in 2615, to the effect that certain phrases in Catullus 64 cannot be taken as evidence of Ennian influence on Catullus because such phrases "haben jetzt die römische Poesie so durchsetzt, dass der Ennianische Ursprung vergessen ist". These words give pretty clearly the argument in my review of Norden's book referred to in the text above.

¹ This agrees, I may note, with Nonius Marcellus's usual method of citation; see my review of Marx's edition of Lucilius, A. J. P. XXIX 478-482, especially 481, and the references there to Lindsay's Nonius Marcellus's Dictionary of Republican Latin.

² It would be easy to suggest that in Festus VIII is an error for XVIII.

³ Nonius Marcellus, too, cites in this fashion; see, e. g., Lindsay's edition of Nonius (1903), I. xxxviii-xxxix, and my review of Norden's *Aeneid* VI in A. J. P. XXVII 77.

Assuming now, as Vahlen does, with good reason, I think, that these modes of citation were copied by Festus from Verrius, we shall see that Verrius's way of citing Ennius was widely different from Cicero's or Varro's; see above, pages 19-23. The later scholar, we see, was far more exact (more modern, if you will, in his exactness) not merely than the litterateur Cicero, but than the doctissimus Romanorum himself.

Paulus Diaconus uses a very different method. He names Ennius often, but nowhere does he give the title of a tragedy or the number of the book from which he is quoting. When he gives verses not found in Festus he often combines with them explanatory glosses (lxxi).

In one passage (Praef. to Book 9. 16) Vitruvius speaks reverently of Ennius. Valerius Maximus, Phaedrus, Velleius show no particular knowledge of the poet (lxxii, lxxiii). By Nero's time Ennius's fame had waned so much that Seneca makes light of him in various places (but then, let us note with Vahlen, he held Cicero in no great esteem), and Persius laughs at him (lxxiii-lxxv). Pliny the Elder gives us some new fragments (lxxvi). Silius Italicus admired Ennius greatly (lxxvi: see 12. 393 ff.); Statius, too, valued him (lxxvii). But Martial (the apostle of the passing moment, I might call him) naturally held him rather cheap (5. 10. 7, 11. 90. 5).

Quintilian's famous judgment of Ennius in 10. 1. 88 contains a mixture of "veneratio" and "despicientia" (cf. 1. 8. 8, 10).¹ He cites verses or parts of verses from the *Annales* not infrequently; commonly, however, these are known to us from other sources. Besides, he usually does not name the *Annales* or even Ennius himself. The tragedies he very seldom cites. In one place, however (9. 3. 26), he gives us valuable information concerning the theme of one of Ennius's *Saturae* (lxxviii-lxxix).

After Quintilian's time Ennius's fame steadily diminished. In the age of the Antonines, however, given as it was to archaism, his memory was inevitably revived (lxxx). In Fronto, Gellius and Apuleius we have many passages of importance from him. In Fronto's letters and those of the Caesars to him Ennius frequently appears (lxxxi-lxxxiii). Gellius shows the greatest

¹ Cf. Skutsch, 2618: "Die Verstösse gegen seine Lektüre bei Martial . . . und bei Quintilian . . . sind wohl bessere Zeichen der Zeit als die Imitationen bei Silius und Statius".

reverence for him, and cites him repeatedly, giving important additions to our stock of fragments.¹ Being a painstaking grammarian Gellius, usually, in citing the *Annales*, gives the book; at the least he tells us that he is citing from the *Annales*. The tragedies, too, he cites often, and accurately, giving regularly the name of the play involved. Finally, in 2. 29, "De saturis Ennianis egregie meritus est" (lxxxiii-lxxxvi).

This last matter Vahlen discusses in detail on pages ccxi-ccxiii, a passage which is, to my mind, in some respects the finest in all this splendid book. Vahlen may well point with pride to the fact that he was the first to see that here we have in very deed and truth genuine fragments of Ennius (see his first edition, lxxxix ff.). In sections 3-16 Gellius is giving what seems to be a prose version, ostensibly his own, of a fable of Aesop about an *avicula cassita* (cf. the comment in §§ 1-2, 17-19). Then, in § 20, he adds: Hunc Aesopi apologum Q. Ennius in satiris scite admodum et venuste versibus quadratis composuit. Quorum duo postremi isti sunt, quos habere cordi et memoriae operae pretium esse hercle puto (then follow two verses in trochaic tetrameters). There is nothing, then, in the whole chapter that would naturally lead one to suppose that Gellius had Ennius's verse-translation of the Greek before him in §§ 3-16; indeed, all the implications of the chapter lead away from such a conclusion. It would be easy to charge Gellius with disingenuousness; at the least he has stated the facts carelessly, for, as Vahlen noted, fifty years ago, we have in §§ 3-16 not merely "color quidam antiquitatis", in the form of archaisms of vocabulary, forms, and syntax, but no small number of parts of trochaic verses can be detected in Gellius's words as they stand, and others can be got by slight transpositions of words. Hence Vahlen concluded in his first edition that "(Gellius) non tam ex Aesopo sua convertisse quam Ennii carmen secutus contexuisse sermonem videtur". Vahlen gave examples both of these archaisms and of these verse-parts in his first edition; in the later book he strengthens his case by further citations along these lines.

Now, in 1894, I published in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler*, 126-171, a paper entitled *Archaism in Aulus Gellius*. I was at that time not familiar at all with Vahlen's

¹ See my discussion of Gellius's attitude toward Ennius, in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler* (1894), 132-133.

Ennius, and so was quite unaware of what he had said about Gellius 2. 29. But I could not fail to note that there were numerous archaisms in this short chapter. In a footnote I give references to places in my paper in which I discussed archaisms in this chapter.¹ To this phase of Gellius's words no one could

¹ See Drisler Studies, 143-144, s. v. *crastini*; 144, s. v. *luci* (*primo luci*); 146, s. v. *fervit*; 159, s. v. *necessum*; 166, s. v. *nidulari*. *temperi* in § 11 should probably be added.

Some archaisms of syntax occur in the chapter (matters of syntax were not handled in the paper to which I have referred).

In § 6 we have *dum . . . iret cibum pullis quaesitum*. There seems some warranty for regarding the use of the first supine with a direct object as in Gellius's time an archaism (see Schmalz,⁴ page 465; Draeger 2. 857-865, especially § 608). Other examples, some of them striking, in Gellius are 3. 13. 2; 6. 3. 7, 44 (in this chapter Gellius has before him, directly or indirectly, a speech of Cato Censor); 9. 15. 3; (10. 6. 2); 10. 19. 3; 12. 1. 2, 9; 14. 6. 1, 5; 16. 5. 9; 16. 11. 6; 18. 5. 3. For examples of the supine without an object in Gellius see 6. 14. 8; 12. 13. 3. It is to be noted, however, that Rodolf Frobenius, in a dissertation on *Die Syntax des Ennius* (Nördlingen, Beck, 1910), page 67, finds only three examples of this usage (supine with object) in Ennius: our passage, and Ann. (272), 348.

Schmalz, page 565, § 325, holds that, after the classical period, *cum* causal, adversative, and concessive appears exclusively with the indicative till we come to Commodianus (so too Draeger 2. 680). Yet it is to me very difficult to see, naturally, anything but causal force (assuming that a *cum*-clause ever has causal force) in Gell. 2. 29. 1 *Aesopus . . . sapiens existimatus est, cum . . . praecepit et censuit*; 6. 3. 25 *dignus . . . laude est cum . . . ingenue ac religiose dicere visus est . . . quod sentiebat et . . . flexit et transtulit* (in this chapter, we noted above, Gellius had Cato Censor before him); 11. 8. 4 *Ne tu . . . nimium nugator es cum maluisti culpam deprecari quam culpa vacare*; 12. 12. 4 *ἀκοινονόητοι homines estis cum ignoratis*. Considering Gellius's deliberate use of archaisms it seems to me not worth while to seek to explain away the apparent causal force in these examples (this *could* be done in 2. 29. 1, but in the other examples the tense in the main clause makes this difficult indeed).

In § 8 we have these words: *Haec ubi ille dixit et discessit*. Schmalz, page 497, § 244, characterizes such sentences with *atque* as "ausschliesslich plautinisch mit Nachahmung bei Gellius". Compare Gellius 17. 20. 4 *Haec verba ubi lecta sunt atque ibi Taurus mihi inquit*. For examples in Plautus see Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*, s. v. *atque* 16, page 179. The Plautine examples show only *atque*; Gellius has one example each of *atque* and *et*.

In § 7 we have *fac amicos eas et roges*. The word-order is noteworthy: see Vahlen's note, page 208. The nearest parallels are Terence Ad. 917 *tu illas abi et traduce*, and Plautus Am. 32 *propterea pacem advenio et ad vos adfero* (but here the text is disputed). Phrases involving a form of *ire* followed by *et* and a form of another verb occur several times at least in Gellius, e. g. 2. 29. 11 *quin potius imus et oramus*; 14. 2. 23; 20. 10. 5. The usage is

be blind. I saw also clearly enough that in reality throughout this chapter Gellius had had before him Ennius (see page 144, s. v. *crastini*). But, as said above, it had been reserved for Vahlen to detect in Gellius parts of Ennius's verses, by the simple process of reading Gellius aloud. Without a change of a letter, said Vahlen, we get trochaic rhythm in the following: "*ét manus iam póstulare;¹ méssim hanc nobis ádiuvent; státim dicto oboédiant; it diés et amici núlli eunt; fiet nunc dubiô procul; nón metetur nêque necessumst hódie uti vos aúferam*". By slight emendations he derived the following: "*vós modo hoc advértite: si quid dicetur dénuo; út iam statim próperet inque aliúm sese asportét locum, alia*".

On these phrases I desire to make one comment. Vahlen twice holds that the *a* in *statim* was long in Ennius. In a footnote to ccxii he refers to his note on Ai. 1 (= Scen. 17). There he cites Nonius 393. 13 *statim* producta prima syllaba a stando perseveranter et aequaliter significat (quotations follow from Plautus, Terence, Ennius, Afranius). Vahlen then adds: "De prosodia vocis, non de significatione, Nonius videtur falli: cf. Ritscheliuss opp. iv, pp. 274 sqq." But if Nonius was wrong about the prosody, two of Vahlen's examples cited above cease to be perfect verses or parts of verses.² But, under the circumstances, we should not expect throughout perfect verses or parts of verses.

I am not quite sure, even after repeated reading of Vahlen's discussion, whether he regarded his list of verse-parts in our Gellius passage as complete. However, I shall add some others which I seem to have detected: *Avícula est parva, nómen est cassíta; filium adulescéntem; operámque mutuám dent* (though here word-accent and ictus less clearly coincide); *Háec ubi ille*

common in Plautus: see Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*, under *eo(ire)*, B, 2 (entire), p. 503; also *ibid.*, 3 (entire), pp. 503-504, where we have examples of *ire* followed by *atque* or *que* and the forms of another verb; p. 528, under β , p. 529 under ϑ .

¹ In passing I wish to compare with the Ennian-Gellian phrase in § 7, *videsne . . . haec ematuruisse et manus iam postulare*, Lucan 1. 28-29, *horrida quod dumis multosque inarata per annos/Hesperia est desuntque manus poscentibus arvis . . .*

² On *statim* see Palmer on Plaut. Am. 239; Müller, 224. Neither from the two places in Plautus where the word occurs (Am. 239, 276) nor from Terence Ph. 790 can it be shown positively that the *a* is long. Lindsay, however, *The Latin Language*, page 556, accepts "O. Latin *stātim*".

dixit et discéssit; dōminus (inquiunt) misit qui amicos rogēt, uti luce oriēte / vēniant et melānt (read *qui amicos*: defective verses, to be sure, but still the trochaic swing is marked); *māgnam partem cēssatores sūnt; quin pōlius imus et cognatos ādfinesque nōstros oramus; hōc pulli pavefācti matri nūntiant; sine metu ac sine cūra sint; frumētum nosmetīpsi manibus nōstris cras melēmus; tempus ēst cedendi et ābeundi; (fiet nunc dubio procul) / quōd futurum dixit*. All these additional examples are won without alteration of the text.

To Apuleius alone we owe our knowledge of the *Hedyphagetica*, as well as the distich (Ann. 62-63) which gives the names of the twelve gods. He cites also a verse of the *Thyestes* and words of *Iphigenia*. It appears, then, that he knew the *Annales* and the tragedies; indeed, says Vahlen, we may readily believe that he "*suam orationem colore Enniano distinxisse*".

After the time of Gellius and Apuleius Ennius was for a season forgotten, but from the age of Constantine to the end of the reign of Theodosius I, an age of grammarians and of "*artium scriptores*", he is often mentioned, especially by Nonius Marcellus (lxxxix ff.). Nonius gives us very much from the older writers in general, but "*praeter ceteros Ennii carminibus praecipuam et fructuosam operam dedit*". From him we derive many new fragments; usually he cites full verses, "*nonnumquam sententias plenius quam opus erat perscribens . . .*" He gives also, in citing, not merely the poet's name, but the title of the play or the book of the *Annales* or the *Saturae* from which he is quoting. Sometimes he uses a quotation from Ennius under different lemmata; on the other hand he often fails to employ in his treatment of a given word an Ennius example of whose existence we have knowledge now from other sources. The long and intricate discussion of these and kindred points is summed up on xcv, with the following results. To Nonius alone we owe most of our knowledge of the *Saturae*; from him alone we gain what we have of the *Ambracia* and of the comedies *Pancratiastes* and *Cupuncula*. He was ignorant of the *Euhemerus* and of the *Hedyphagetica*, perhaps also of the *Sota*. Of the tragedies he does not use the *Alexander* and the *Iphigenia*; in general, however, he used the tragedies more than he did the *Annales* (contrast the practice of Festus: see above, p. 26). He derived much of his material from the grammarians, particularly Festus and Gellius, perhaps also Varro; "*tamen nihil futilius est (de*

Ennio loquor) quam credere velle Nonium ad grammaticos et huius generis scriptores potissimum excerptos se dedisse. Qui si hoc volebat, de Ennii Alexandro et Iphigenia multa discere ex Festo, de Iphigenia multa ex Gellio potuit . . . Quodsi qui tamen affirmare malent Nonium maximam partem glossarum cum exemplis ex nescio quibus glossariis abstulisse, nonne mirum esset, non alios quoque grammaticos sive priores Nonio sive posteriores eosdem fontes adiisse ex iisque hausisse? Quod quia factum non esse apparet, maneat hoc Nonium Ennii carmina et libros studiose pertractasse, hoc est ad eum modum quem veteres omnino huic rei operam dare consuerunt".¹ This discussion and this summary throw interesting light on the much vexed question of Nonius's sources.

Nonius's immediate successors give us little of Ennius, however; Donatus is more fruitful than they (xcvi), but less so than Nonius. Servius again is "unus de locupletissimis de Ennio auctoribus", though even he passed over much that he might have used from Ennius (cii-ciii); further, "ubi Ennius memoratur, non semper primo quo poterat loco, nedum omnibus quibus poterat aut debebat afferri". In his commentary on the *Aeneid*, which he wrote first, says Vahlen, he cites many verses

¹I note briefly that to some of these questions Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin*, returns a different answer. On page 7 (first full paragraph) and repeatedly in the notes, pages 10 ff., he suggests that readers of Nonius, recalling a quotation from an earlier passage in Nonius, entered it later, where, using the same lemma, the lexicographer supplemented his previous treatment of a word. On page 101 Lindsay agrees with Vahlen in general concerning Nonius's methods of work, holding that "Nonius himself read through the texts or at least the marginal annotations of the texts". Nevertheless he implies, what he nowhere, so far as I have noticed, specifically says, that Nonius owed his quotations from Ennius rather to glossaries or to other authors—e. g. Gellius—than to firsthand study of Ennius himself. He credits Nonius with possessing but a single volume of Ennius, containing the *Hectoris Lytra* and the *Telephus*, in that order, and perhaps other plays; see pages 8, 116. In his text-edition of Nonius, 3. 941-943, he gives a long list of passages quoted by Nonius from Ennius. There is one unfortunate result of all this, in that we have in Nonius no long sequences of citations from Ennius, such as we have from other authors, e. g., Plautus, given in strict accordance with the numerical order of the citations in their original setting (see Lindsay, *op. cit.*, *passim*, but especially pages 35-36, 88 ff.; see also above, page 26, n. 1). The editor of the fragments of Ennius is thus deprived of what might have been a very real help; see again my review of Marx's *Lucilius*, A. J. P. XXVIII 481-482.

from the *Annales*; once only he names the *Annales*, once only he adds the number of the book; elsewhere he gives merely the poet's name, using various methods of citation. He does not cite freely from the plays; once he names the *Iphigenia*, but commonly he merely attaches the poet's name to his citation.

Of most importance, however, in Servius for our purposes are rather "(quae) quaedam generatim afferunt ad res ab Ennio compositas pertinentia" (civ). This sentence Vahlen explains thus: "Dico talia: Aen. I. 20 'audierat' a Iove aut a fatis . . . et perite 'audierat': in Ennio enim inducitur Iuppiter promittens Romanis excidium Carthagini . . . Versus Ennii non attulit, sed significat quid actum sit apud Ennium in concilio deorum, quaeque ibi Iuppiter promiserit, ea vult Iunonem Vergilianam audisse . . .". So again in his note on Aen. I. 281 "ne nunc quidem versum Ennii afferre voluit, sed sententiam indicare, quae fortasse pluribus verbis exposita erat. Videmus Servium attendere si quid est in Ennii annalibus quod convertere ad interpretandam Vergilii compositionem liceat". "Eaque omnia quae huius generis sunt unius Servii beneficio nituntur". More examples of all this follow on civ-cv.

Most of the hexameters cited by Servius in notes on the *Aeneid* as from Ennius are unknown from other sources; many of these, again, come from Daniel's Servius. Not full verses are cited, but full thoughts, whether these take less or more than one verse. Though Servius errs at times in his citations of Plautus, Terence, etc., Vahlen thinks he is generally right in his quotations from Ennius (cv-cvi). On pages cvi-cviii Vahlen discusses in detail certain modes of citation, apparently, from Ennius in the notes on the *Aeneid*, which, if not rightly understood, will greatly mislead the student.

The commentary on the *Eclogues* gives us just two "frustula Enniana", of two words each, whose place in Ennius cannot be determined. The notes on the *Georgics* are richer in Enniana; the mode of citation, again, from the *Annales* differs from that used in the commentary on the *Aeneid*, for here, though some verses are cited merely by Ennius's name, most are referred to a definite book (cix-cx). Citations from the plays are very rare in this commentary.

On pages cx-cxiii Vahlen discusses the Enniana to be found in the *Scholia Vergiliana* (*Bernensia* and *Veronensia*) and in the

Commentary on the Eclogues and the Georgics ascribed to M. Valerius Probus.

This brings us to Macrobius (cxiii ff.). Once again Ennius is falling into disfavor, for in Sat. 1. 4. 17, Servius, about to cite him, says, by way of preface, Ennius, nisi cui videtur inter nostrae aetatis politiores munditias respuendus (cf. 6. 3. 9; 6. 9. 9). In the first books of the Saturnalia we have but a few citations from Ennius, widely scattered; "a sexto autem Saturnalium libro totum *θύλακον* versuum Ennianorum excutere coepit", because "in sexto quanta pars carminum Vergilii ad scriptores Romanos superioris aevi redeat explanare studuit. Inter quos Ennius principem locum obtinet". What he purposes to do he sets forth in 6. 1. 7. Then in §§ 8–24 follow a list of Vergil's borrowings from Ennius; we get throughout complete verses (or pairs of verses) from Ennius, from the Annales, but not always complete sense. If more than one citation from Ennius is given in a single section, these are given in the order of the books; so in § 9 we have citations from the first, the third and the tenth books; in § 17 we have citations from Books 4 and 17. If we view §§ 15–21 together, we find citations running thus: from Books 1, 3, 4 (and 16 in § 17), 6, 7, 8, 17. Section 22 shows passages from Books 6, 8, 17.¹ Most of these verses, furthermore, we owe to Macrobius alone (cxiv–cxv).

In 6. 2. 1 Macrobius declares his intention nunc locos locis componere . . . ut unde formati sint quasi de speculo cognoscas. In § 16 he comes to Ennius; he cites some passages from the Annales, some from the tragedies and the Scipio. We get now, naturally, passages of two or more verses; all these we owe to Macrobius alone. Finally, in §§ 30–32, without citation of definite verses, he indicates various passages in which Vergil was deeply indebted to Naevius and to Ennius. Here again Macrobius is our sole authority. In 6. 3, in setting forth verses which Vergil might well enough have derived from Homer, though they had been used by Roman poets before him, he cites more Enniana. See further cxvi–cxvii. Vahlen sums up by declaring that Macrobius "inter meritissimos de Enni memoria grammaticos referri par (est)".

On pages cxviii–cxxii Vahlen discusses the attempts that have been made to find Enniana in Claudianus; on pages cxxii–cxxiv

¹ See above on Verrius Flaccus's and Nonius's mode of citation, p. 26. Cf. also p. 32, n. 1, at end.

Jerome and Augustine come in for mention ; so also Priscian and Isidorus (cxxiv-cxxix). Priscian cites very often from the *Annales*, sometimes too from the tragedies. He cites generally full verses, giving a complete thought. He gives also not merely the poet's name, but the title of the work and the number of the book. Frequently, too, he is our sole source for the verses he quotes. Vahlen believes (cxxvi) that Priscian read and excerpted Ennius for himself. Isidorus, finally, cites by the poet's name alone, without title of work or number of book.

Not content with having traced the *vestigia Ennii* thus far Vahlen brings together (cxxvi ff.) a few references to Ennius in the days after Isidorus, though he declares that he did not regard it as his duty "*Ennii memoriam etiam per medii aevi quod vocatur tempora persequi*". Then comes a discussion of the various editions of Ennius, older and later, and, finally (cxxxvii-cxliv), an account of the *Novae Editionis Subsidia*, that is, of the authoritative editions of the various authors whose names recur so often in the *testimonia* of our book (see above, page 3).

Here I must stop for the present. Some day, perhaps, I shall recur to the subject, by writing a commentary on the fragments, and discussing in connection therewith the second part of Vahlen's *Prolegomena*, entitled *De Libris Ennianis*. I had planned to include the latter discussion in the present paper, but the studies required by this article have made it entirely clear that the rest of the *Prolegomena* can be best treated only in connection with a virtual commentary on the fragments.

Let me close, then, as I began, by an expression of my profound admiration of the enormous industry and patience and of the wondrous scholarship displayed throughout this book. I am aware that at many points I have ventured to question the soundness of the conclusions based by Vahlen on the facts he adduces. That result, I submit, was inevitable ; in view of the scantiness of our fragments, after all, it is most hazardous to base conjectures and inferences, at least of certain kinds, upon them ; inevitably, therefore, any careful and lengthy examination of this book would seem to emphasize unduly points of difference between the author and the reviewer.

CHARLES KNAPP.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

II.—THE INDO-EUROPEAN PALATALS IN SANSKRIT.

1. The Indic and the Iranian languages differ greatly in their treatment of the IE. stopped consonants. We are struck by the frequent change of stops to spirants in Iranian, as opposed to the "conservative" history, in this respect, of the Sanskrit. The former is a spirantizing language, like the old Germanic.

Thus the Iranian shows us spirants for the IE. aspirated voiceless stops, as in Av. *paθ-a* O. P. *paθi-m* (Sk. *path- pathi-*), and for the IE. voiceless stops before consonants, as in Av. *āfš* (Sk. *āp*), *suxra-* O. P. *θuxra-* (Sk. *śukrā-s*), Av. *θwqm* O. P. *θ(u)wam* (Sk. *tvām*).¹

The Younger Avestan, moreover, shows us spirants for the IE. aspirated and simple voiced stops, as in *aiwi* (Sk. *abhi*) and *γnā* (Sk. *gnā*). We may note also such YAv. double spirants as in *uxda-* (Sk. *ukthā-m*) and *vaxδra-* (Sk. *vaktrā-m*).

2. To recall these well-known facts would be, strictly speaking, sufficient for our purposes in the present discussion: it may, however, be instructive to consider briefly what physiological causes probably brought about these changes of pronunciation in Iranian and Younger Avestan.

The spirantizing of voiceless aspirates in Iranian is parallel to that in Germanic, and may like the latter be attributed to a pronunciation with *increased stress of breath*. Cf. especially H. Meyer, Z. f. d. Alt. 45, 101 ff. The agreement of Iranian and Germanic in not spirantizing these sounds after a spirant, as in Av. *spara-ē* (Sk. *sphurā-ti*) is significant not only of a like cause for the Iranian and the Germanic phenomena, but also of this particular cause: for the utterance of a preceding spirant, in requiring a comparatively great volume of breath, lessens the breath stress for the following stop and so prevents spirantiza-

¹ As constant reference to an often divergent set of views might prove confusing, we may here refer once for all to the treatment of the IE. palatals in Aryan in Brugmann's *Grundriss I*², §§ 610–618. 714–720. 1007, 12, which has been looked upon as the standard view of the subject. All examples are taken from the *Grundriss* and from Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*³, §§ 142. 145–147. 214–224, c. 612, d. 617, b. 832, a. 833, a. 890, a.

tion. Similarly in E. *ten* we pronounce an aspirated fortis, *t^hen* or *then*, but in E. *step* a simple fortis or voiceless lenis, *step* or *sdep*. So also G. *tut* vs. *Stute*, Dan. *Time* vs. *Stime*; and it is conceivable that the very great breath stress of Dan. *Time* may in time produce *θime* while the *t* in *Stime* would be retained as a stop.

The similar retention of the stop after nasals in Iranian, as in Av. *pantā* (Sk. *pānthā-s*) is an indication that breath stress was weaker here than in Germanic, where spirantization took place in spite of the escape of breath in a preceding nasal. Another indication of such a difference between Iranian and Germanic is the retention in Iranian of voiceless unaspirated stops. The general increase of breath stress in Iranian was sufficient to make spirants of voiceless stops followed by aspiration (with open glottis), but not of voiceless stops immediately followed by closing of the vocal chords for a vowel, as in Av. *pīta* O. P. *pīā* (Sk. *pītā*). Before a consonant, however, where the closing of the vocal chords was not so immediate, spirantization took place, as in the examples above given. This is an illustration of the familiar fact that the utterance of a voiceless sound, i. e., of one with open position of the glottis, involves the passing through the mouth of far more breath than the utterance of a voiced sound, during which the vocal chords are closed and allow breath to pass only in the interstices of their vibration,—compare the well-known experiment of trying to blow out a candle first with a voiced, then with a voiceless sound.

Thus we may perhaps also explain the fact that the voiced stops became voiceless in Germanic, but in Iranian, where the breath stress was weaker, remained sonant. This is for various reasons a most doubtful matter, as is also the spirantizing of the voiced aspirates in Germanic; suffice it therefore to note that in Germanic both these classes of sounds were changed to sounds requiring more breath for utterance, whereas in Iranian this was not the case, aspirate and simple sonant stops here coinciding, most probably as simple sonant stops.

A different explanation is necessary for the phenomena of Younger Avestan. Here the Iranian voiced stops became voiced spirants. Increased breath stress alone would probably have turned these sounds into voiceless stops, as in Germanic and later in High German and Danish; it seems rather as if in the Younger Avestan *looseness of articulation* were involved. This

is surely the case where Younger Avestan changed Iran. *fʰt xʰt* to *fð xð*, as in *uxða-* and *vaxʰðra-*. Such groups as *fʰt xʰt* can be conveniently pronounced with any degree or increase of breath stress; they are stable in such highly stressed languages as English, German, and Danish. The YAv. change to double spirants is a decided sign of loose articulation of stops.

3. It is probable, then, that the Iranian dialects diverged from the Sanskrit in being spoken with increased breath stress, and that the Younger Avestan further differed in loosely articulating its stops. However this may be, it is certain that the Iranian languages differed from the Sanskrit in *tending toward spirant pronunciation of stopped consonants*, and that this is especially true of the Younger Avestan. In the following pages, whenever mention is made of the "stronger breath stress of the Iranian" or "looser articulation of the Avestan", the empirical reader will always be able to substitute the words "more spirant pronunciation" without in any way affecting the argument. To what extent the greater conservatism of Sanskrit is due to the greater antiquity of the language in our records need not here concern us: the nature of the divergence between early Iranian and Sanskrit as we know them is all that will affect our present considerations.¹

4. This difference between the phonetic character of Iranian and Sanskrit may help us to understand the differing development of the IE. palatals in the two languages. We should first have to form a hypothesis, however, as to the character of these sounds in Indo-European, were it not that the opinion of Brugmann (Gr. I², § 543 and K. Vgl. Gr. § 157) has found general acceptance. Brugmann's view is that the stop-articulation of these sounds is the more original; that they were in Indo-European slightly palatalized *k*-sounds (*kʰ kʰh gʰ gʰh*) which in the development of the so-called *centum* languages were not distinguished from simple velar consonants, but in the eastern (*satəm*) languages became sibilants. Phonetic parallels are of course in favor of this view, for the gradual change of slightly palatalized velars to sibilants is a familiar phenomenon. A palatalized velar *kʰ gʰ* is pronounced as a simple stop articulated somewhat farther forward in the mouth than a plain velar (French

¹ In the above and following paragraphs theorizing as to the nature of the IE. voiced aspirate stops has been avoided,—or rather, it has been relegated from here to a note at the end of these remarks.

dialects, Norwegian dialects, Lithuanian, modern Slavic languages, Magyar).¹ Articulation of the middle tongue against the higher parts of the palate is not so rapid or precise as in other parts of the mouth. Especially as the removal of the tongue after the stop is not so quick as after a velar or dental, the resulting acoustic effect resembles an affricate,—the stop being followed by the sound of the breath passing between the palate and the tongue ($k' > k'h > k'x'$). Cf. Brugmann Gr. I¹, §47, 1. Meanwhile the point of articulation passes forward, approaching that of dental consonants ($k'x' > t's'$), as in Old French (ch, g), English, Norwegian, Swedish, Slavic languages. In some languages, which tend to articulate either with the back or with the tip of the tongue and not with intermediate points, the palatal character of $t's', d'z'$ may be nearly or wholly given up, the result resembling $tš, dž$, as in Italian and English. Where the palatal character is retained the stop grows less and less close and is finally assimilated to the spirant: the result is a more or less palatal $š, s$, or $ž$ sound, as in modern French ($c ch, g$), Italian dialects ($š', ž'$, cf. Passy, *Petite Phonétique Comparée*, p. 85), Portuguese (c, g), and modern Slavic languages. As the reverse of this process is very rare—if indeed it be not inconceivable,—we must assume for the IE. palatals a pronunciation $k' k'h g' g'h$. From this developed the sibilants of the *satəm* languages.

5. The standard view then supposes that in all the so-called *satəm* languages—and therefore in all Aryan and long before any distinction between Iranian and Indic—this development had uniformly taken place; in other words, that any and all Iranian and Sanskrit representations of the IE. palatals are later forms of Ar. sibilants $š' š'h ž' ž'h$ (before stops $š ž$, before sibilants $x \gamma$).

This hypothesis does very well for the facts of Iranian, where the IE. palatals are everywhere pronounced as sibilants, e. g., Av. *vasō* O. P. *vasiy* (Gr. *ἰκόν*), Av. *zi-zanāš* O. P. *vispa- z(a)na-* (Gr. *γίρος*), Av. *hazah-* (Gr. *ἰχθυ* Goth. *sigis*),—as sibilants even in the combinations IE. $\hat{k}s \hat{g}zh$, e. g., Av. *aša-* (Gr. *ἄξων*), Av. *uz-vašaš* (Lat. *vexit*). We know, moreover, that these sibilants were well on in their development in the Aryan period, for the new palatals which in Aryan times developed from IE. velars and labiovelars before IE. front vowels did not coincide with the

¹ An early stage is heard in the German pronunciation, e. g., of *Kind* as opposed to *Kalb* and *Kuchen*.

old IE. palatals, but remained as palatal stops or affricates \check{c} \check{j} , as in Av. *čit* O. P. *čiy* (Sk. *cid*), Av. *jvaiti* O. P. *jvāhy* (Sk. *jīva-ti*). In other words: before the palatalization in Aryan times (earlier than IE. \check{c} \check{d} $>$ $\check{ā}$) of IE. velars and labiovelars, the IE. palatals had developed so far that the new palatals never coincided with them—never “caught up” with them:—the IE. palatals had, we may safely say, developed into sibilants.

This, the standard view, is further supported when we consider the characteristics of Iranian mentioned in §§ 1–3. Strong breath stress (or at any rate spirant tendency) in pronouncing k' g' makes the spirant glide more noticeable than otherwise, so that the affricate stage is more quickly reached than where the breath stress is weaker. Strong breath stress (especially if combined with loose tongue articulation) hastens the weakening of the stop element and its assimilation to the spirant element. Iran. s z were somewhat palatal sibilants, cf. such spellings (or dialectic forms) as O. P. *a-θaha^h* (Av. *sanha te* Sk. *śaśa-ti*), *ā-yadana-* (Av. *yazaitē* Sk. *yāia-tē*). The development of IE. $\hat{k}s$ $\hat{g}zh$ from $k's$ $g'zh$ through more and more relaxed and spirant articulations to \check{s} \check{z} is also natural; it is of little moment whether or not we assume an intermediate stage $\chi\check{s}$ $\gamma\check{z}$: some such thing there must have been.

6. When we come to the Sanskrit, however, we find the conditions—as indeed we might expect them—quite different. IE. \hat{k} before vowels, semivowels, nasals, and r has, to be sure, gone through the development to the palatal sibilant \check{s} as in *vaśmi* (Gr. *έκών*); note especially the conversion of s before Sk. palatals to the same sound as in *tātaś ca*.

Aside from this case (and one other), however, the facts differ greatly from those of Iranian. To begin with, IE. \hat{g} before vowels, semivowels, etc., has in early Sanskrit times the pronunciation of a simple voiced palatal stop g' or better d' (written j as in *jānas-*), coinciding with the d' developed in Aryan from IE. velars and labiovelars before IE. front vowels (as in *jīva-ti*). As to the character of this sound in early times, cf. Whitney, l. c., § 44, a and especially Brugmann, K. Vgl. Gr., § 22, 4, with references. As was inevitable, this sound came to assume a spirant glide (cf. § 4), but in classical times it never acquired the metrical value of a double consonant and was never considered otherwise than as a simple voiced stop. According to the standard view, now, this palatal stop is a development from an Ar. sibilant \check{z} —a

reversion, as it were, to an older state: IE. \hat{g} ($= g'$) $>$ Ar. ǵ $>$ Sk. j ($= d'$),—cf. for instance Brugmann, Gr. I², § 62, Anm. 2. Phonetically this is of course most unlikely,—just as it is unlikely that the k -sounds of the *centum* languages are derived from sibilants like those of the *satəm* languages, cf. § 4.

The same holds true of the IE. palatal voiced aspirate: in Sanskrit IE. $\hat{g}h$ and Ar. $g'h$ ($<$ IE. gh g^wh before front vowels) are represented alike as h , e. g. *sáhas-* (Av. *hazah-* Goth. *sigis*) and *hán-ti* (Av. *jainti* Gr. *θεῖν*). Here, indeed, it might be urged that the representation in Sanskrit of IE. $\hat{g}h >$ Ar. $\text{ǵ}h$ had not “reverted” so as to coincide with that of Ar. $g'h$, but that the two sounds never had coincided until they both became h ;—in other words, that IE. $\hat{g}h >$ Ar. $\text{ǵ}h >$ Sk. h and that Ar. $g'h >$ Sk. h . Unfortunately for the current view of this matter there is an obstacle to this assumption: the Sanskrit law of deaspiration, when operating on IE. $\hat{g}h$ leaves the usual representation of IE. g , namely j ($= d'$) as in *jáṅghā* ($<$ IE. $*\hat{g}henghā$, Goth. *gaggs*). Hence the current view of this subject is forced to assume that here too the Ar. sibilant $\text{ǵ}h$ acquired stop value in Sanskrit, that IE. $\hat{g}h$ ($= g'h$) $>$ Ar. $\text{ǵ}h >$ Sk. $*jh$ ($= d'h$) $>$ Sk. h or j ($= d'$). Moreover this return of the sibilant to stop value must have been very early, since Sanskrit deaspiration took place before the change of zh to s , ś , cf. Brugmann, Gr. I², § 827.

Finally there are a few cases of IE. $s\hat{k}(h)$, where we find these sounds represented by Sk. $(c)ch$, as in *chinát-ti* (Gr. *σχιζω*), *ducchúnā* (*du* $\text{ś} + \text{ś}'$ *unā*). This $(c)ch$ makes the preceding vowel “long by position” (Whitney, l. c., §§ 44, a. 227); it is also produced by the combination of $-t \text{ś}'$ —as in *tac chakyaṃ* (*tat* + $\text{ś}'akyaṃ$): hence its character as a double sound, namely as a palatal affricate ($t\text{ś}'$) is plain. Note also the phonetic spelling $c\text{ś}'$. Here again the standard view is forced to suppose that IE. $s\hat{k}(h)$ ($= sk'(h)$) $>$ Ar. $\text{ś}'\text{ś}'(h) >$ Sk. $(c)ch$ ($= t\text{ś}'$)—again a development contrary to the usual course of such sounds and to the course which such sounds had previously taken in the same language.

7. The current supposition, in short, is that the IE. palatals developed uniformly over the entire Aryan territory: that their spirantization and stop-loosening was as fast in the otherwise “conservative” Sanskrit territory as in the Iranian with its spirant tendency; that when Sanskrit and Iranian grew to be

separate languages the former as well as the latter pronounced the IE. palatals as sibilants $\text{ś} \text{ś}h \text{ṣ} \text{ṣ}h$. The Sanskrit, however,—repenting the precipitate course it had taken in company with the Iranian,—changed $\text{śś}(h)$ ($< \text{IE. } s\hat{k}(h)$) back to $(c)ch$ ($= \text{śś}$), ṣ back to j ($= \text{ḍ}$), and $\text{ṣ}h$ back to jh ($= \text{ḍ}h$, later ḍ or h), leaving only ś at the end of the alphabet as a spirant,—a last trace of the bad company and profligate habits of the past.

If we examine the actual forms of the Sanskrit language, however, we find nothing anomalous; and if, in tracing the origin of these forms and in comparing them to Iranian forms, we keep in mind the physiologic aspect of the process of palatalization (outlined in §4) and apply what we know about the difference between Iranian and Sanskrit treatment of consonants (cf. §§ 1-3), we shall probably find in the history of the IE. palatals in Sanskrit nothing unusual or surprising. Beginning with the Indo-European, we shall now try to reconstruct this history.

8. The IE. palatals $\hat{k} kh \hat{g} gh$ (probably pronounced $\text{ḱ} \text{ḱ}h \text{ḡ} \text{ḡ}h$, cf. §4) seem to have gone rapidly along the course of palatalization in one part of the Aryan territory (in which otherwise also spirant tendency later appears), namely in that dialect which later became the Iranian language; for, when the Ar. velars ($< \text{IE. velars and labiovelars}$) became palatal before front vowels, these new palatals were in this dialect distinct from the old palatals.¹ At the end of the Aryan period then, the Iranian started out with one set of more or less purely spirant palatal sounds, say $\text{ś} \text{ś}h \text{ṣ} \text{ṣ}h$, and one set of (new) palatal stops $\text{ḱ} \text{ḱ}h \text{ḡ} \text{ḡ}h$.

The further history of the palatals in Iranian is clear (cf. §5). The old palatals, if not already pronounced as sibilants soon reached this pronunciation. Examples are:

- (a) Av. s ($< \text{IE. } \hat{k}$): *vasō* O. P. *vasiy* (Gr. *ἰκών*).
 $(< \text{IE. } s\hat{k})$: *jasaiti* (Gr. *βάσκε*).
 $(< \text{IE. } s\hat{k}h)$: *hi-sidyāt* (Gr. *σχίζω*).
 $(< \text{IE. } \hat{k}s\hat{k})$: *pərsaiti* ($< \text{IE.}^* \text{pr}\hat{k}-s\hat{k}e-ti$).
- (b) Av. z ($< \text{IE. } \hat{g}$): *zi-zanať* O. P. *vispa-z(a)na-*
 $(\text{Gr. } \gammaένος)$.
 $(< \text{IE. } \hat{g}h)$: *hazah-* (Gr. *ἔχω* Goth. *sigis*).
 $(< \text{IE. } z\hat{g}h)$: GAv. *zaē-mā* (Gr. *σχοίμεν*).

¹ This is much like the state of things in the Slavic languages, e. g. modern Russian, where several degrees of palatalization coexist.

- (c) Av. \check{s} (< IE. $\hat{k}s$): *aša-* (Gr. $\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega\nu$).
 (< IE. $\hat{k}p$): *šiti-š* (Gr. $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$).
 (< IE. $\hat{k}ph$): *rašō* (Gr. $\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\chi\theta\omega$).
 (< IE. $\hat{k}-t$): *vašti* (Gr. $\epsilon\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$).
 (< IE. $\hat{k}-q$): *saškuš-təmō* (< IE.* $\hat{k}e-$ $\hat{k}q-$)
 (d) Av. $\check{š}$ (< IE. $\hat{g}zh$): *uṣ-vaṣaṭ* (Lat. *vexit*).
 (< IE. $\hat{g}-d$): *mər̥ždikəm* (< IE.* $mrg̃-d-$).
 (< IE. $\hat{g}-dh$): *vašdri-š* (< IE.* $uegh-$).
 (< IE. $\hat{g}-bh$): GAv. *višibyo* (dat. abl. pl. of *viš-*).

The new palatals became \check{r} and \check{j} , probably palatal affricates, except in positions where stops became spirant (cf. § 2). In such positions \check{s} and $\check{š}$ were spoken: the coincidence under these conditions with certain representations of the old palatals, (c) and (d) above, affords the best possible example of the connection between spirantizing tendencies and tendencies which accelerate palatalization. Examples:

- (e) Av. \check{r} (< Ar. k'): *rit* O. P. *riy* (Gr. $\tau\iota$).
 (f) Av. \check{j} (< Ar. g'): *jvaiti* O. P. *jvāhy* (Gr. $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\tau\alpha$).
 (< Ar. $g'h$): *jainti* O. P. *a-janam* (Gr. $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$).
 (c) Av. \check{s} (< Ar. k'): GAv. *vašyetē* (Gr. $\epsilon\pi\acute{o}\varsigma$).
 (d) Av. $\check{š}$ (< Ar. g'): *dašaiti* (Goth. *dags*, Lith. *degù*).
 (< Ar. $g'h$): *snaēšaiti* (Gr. $\nu\acute{\iota}\phi-\alpha$).

9. In that dialect of Aryan which later became the Indic language the spirantizing tendency of usual speech was less than in the sister dialect. Consequently palatalization proceeded much less rapidly.

In the utterance of unvoiced sounds, where the glottis is open, more breath is passed through the mouth than in the utterance of voiced sounds.¹ Unvoiced palatal stops, therefore, are more susceptible to affrication and spirantization than voiced stops. In a language where the breath stress is at all strong—strong enough to develop even a voiced palatal with some rapidity—this difference does not show itself; in the early history of Sanskrit, however, we must ascribe to it the more rapid development of IE. \hat{k} ($\hat{k}h$) as compared to \hat{g} $\hat{g}h$.²

¹ Cf. the candle experiment cited in § 2.

² Similarly perhaps F. *ciel* (< Lat. *caelum*), but *gendre* (< Lat. *gener*), with *s* and \check{z} . French breath stress is decidedly weak.

As a consequence of this more rapid development of IE. \hat{k} it came about that when the new Aryan palatals developed from velars before front vowels, the IE. *unvoiced* \hat{k} was already well along toward spirantization, but the IE. *voiced* palatals \hat{g} $\hat{g}h$ were still stops and accordingly coincided with the new voiced palatal stops Ar. g' $g'h$.

In the combinations IE. $s\hat{k}$ and $s\hat{k}h$ the IE. palatal did not develop so rapidly as in independent \hat{k} because the preceding s here lessened the breath stress for the following \hat{k} $\hat{k}h$, cf. § 2. The s was assimilated to the following palatal, becoming a palatal sibilant,—cf. the similar change later in Sanskrit, as in *tataś' ca* from *tatas + ca*. Thus IE. $s\hat{k}(h)$ ($= sk'(h)$) became $\acute{s}k'h > \acute{s}'k'x' > \acute{s}'t'\acute{s}'$ which was then simplified to $t'\acute{s}'^1$ —written $(c)ch$ and pronounced as a prolonged t' plus decided spirant glide, cf. *tac chakyam* in later times, from *tat + ś'akyam* (§ 6), but *tac ca* pronounced *tat'-t'a* (with much slighter glide) and written without the h , from *tat + ca*—the c in *ca* being t' with a slight glide. IE. $s\hat{k}$ also occurs in the compounds *ducchúnā* (*duś + ś'unā*) and *páruccēpa* (*paruś + śēpa*).—IE. $\hat{k}s\hat{k}$ either became $s\hat{k}$ as in Latin *posco* (Brugmann, Gr. I², § 707, Anm.); or, if this change is not to be assumed for Aryan, it became $\hat{k}\hat{k}$ where the lengthened tongue pressure incident to articulation of a double stop preserved the stop value, giving Sk. $t'\acute{s}'$, $((c)ch)$, cf. below.

What has been said in the last three paragraphs applies to the IE. palatals before vowels, semivowels, nasals, and r . In these positions, then, Sanskrit possessed at the end of the Aryan period the following sounds: unvoiced: \acute{s}' , $t'\acute{s}'$, k' (Ar. palatal); voiced: g' (IE. palatal and Ar. palatal), $g'h$ (IE. palatal and Ar. palatal), $g'g'$ (Ar. palatal, from older zg').

These sounds suffered little change in Sanskrit. In historic times \acute{s}' had reached palatal sibilant pronunciation. $t'\acute{s}'$ written $(c)ch$ was a palatal affricate: both $t'\acute{s}'$ as well as $k' g' g'h g'g'$ were spoken with the front rather than the middle of the tongue; the latter set of sounds early added a spirant glide, and were later different from the dentals scarcely in any respect but this. We write t' (Sk. c), d' (Sk. j), $d'h$ (Sk. $*jh > j, h$), $d'd'$ (Sk. jj). As for his last sound: it in no case represents an IE. palatal,

¹ For an analogous simplification, cf. prim. Slavic $\acute{s}'t' >$ Slov. and Russ. $t'\acute{s}'$ (as in *sveča*). Brugmann, Gr. I², § 316, Anm. 2. Cf. also Sk. $vrk\ddot{s}i < *vr\ddot{s}k\ddot{s}i$, $\acute{s}'ik\ddot{s}a-ti < *s'i\ddot{s}k\ddot{s}a-ti$.

but always Ar. *zg'*, which developed like IE. *sĥ*, except that in the voiced sound the final spirant glide was less noticeable. Hence the parallelism of Ar. *zg'* > Sk. *d'd'* with Sk. *cc* rather than *(c)ch*. Cf. also *taj jalām* for *tad + jalām*. Where *d'h* was not deaspirated the voiced stop element was lost, leaving voiced *h*.¹ Thus, in the positions named, the Sanskrit spoke:

- (a) Sk. *ṣ* (< IE. *ĥ*): *váṣmi* (Gr. *ἰκάνω*).
- (b) Sk. *(c)ch* (pr. *č*, < IE. *sĥ*): *gáccha-ti* (Gr. *βάσκει*).
 (< IE. *sĥh*): *chinát-ti* (Gr. *σχιζω*).
 (< IE. *ĥsĥ*): *prcchát-ti* (< IE. **prĥ-sĥe-ti*).
- (c) Sk. *j* (pr. *d'*, < IE. *ĝ*): *jānas-* (Gr. *γένος*).
 (< IE. *ĝh*): *jāṅghā* (Goth. *gaggs*).
 (< Ar. *g'*): *jīva-ti* (Gr. *διαίτα*).
 (< Ar. *g'h*): *ja-ghāna* (Gr. *θείνω, ἰ-πεφρον*).
- (d) Sk. *h* (voiced sound, < IE. *ĝh*): *sāhas-* (Gr. *ἰχω*, Goth. *sigis*).
 (< Ar. *g'h*): *hān-ti* (Gr. *θείνω*).
- (e) Sk. *c* (pr. *č*, < Ar. *č'*): *ci-d* (Gr. *τι*).
- (f) Sk. *jj* (pr. *d'd'*, < Ar. *zg'*): *mājja-ti* (Lith. *mazgótī*).

10. Before sibilants the IE. palatals *ĥ* *ĝ* appear in Sanskrit as *h*. Even here IE. *ĥ* *ĝ* must in Aryan times have possessed some palatalization, though much less than in the same combination in the Iranian part of the territory. We may suppose that IE. *ĥs* was in pre-Indic *čš*. Whatever spirant glide may have followed *č* was of course lost in the sound of the *š*: as the palatalization of the *č* was thus scarcely noticeable, the combination was finally pronounced *čš*, coinciding with *čš* < IE. *qs*, *qʷs*.

The combination IE. *ĝzh* is also found in Sanskrit as *hž*. Now voiced sibilants (except for the sibilant glide of *d'* or *d'd'*) were not pronounced in Sanskrit, but were lost. We may suppose that the Sanskrit breath stress was too weak to enounce a sibilant with closed glottis—of this more below. In Sanskrit pronunciation, then, *zh* would have been lost. We must therefore ascribe the change of IE. *zh* to *ž* to a pre-Sanskrit stage—perhaps to a dialectic change in the Aryan period. In this, Sanskrit resembles Celtic and Germanic, in which also the normal processes of the language acted on a basis of pre-Celt. and pre-Germ.

¹ This pronunciation will be spoken of in the note on the IE. sonant aspirates.

ks ts ps and not *gzh dzh bzh* (cf. Brugmann, Gr. I², §§ 766, 2. 796, b. 827). It is worth noting also that the Iranian alone has preserved the combinations in question as voiced sounds. In Sanskrit, then, IE. *ǵzh* > *kʼš* (for "aspiration" attached to a voiceless *š* sound means nothing) > *kṣ*. Examples:

- (g) Sk. *kṣ* (< IE. *ǵs*): *ákṣa-s* (Gr. *ἀξων*).
 (< IE. *ǵp*): *kṣitt-š* (Gr. *κρίσις*).
 (< IE. *ǵph*): *rdkṣas-* Gr. *ῥίχθων*.
 (< IE. *ǵzh*): *a-vākṣit* (Lat. *vexit*).
 (< IE. *ǵdh*): *kṣam-* (Gr. *χθών*).

11. The statements in the preceding § do not apply to IE. *ǵ + sibilant before stops* (i. e. before *t d*, as no other case seems to occur). In this position IE. *ǵs ǵz* did not become Sk. *kṣ* because the *š* dropped out before the preceding IE. palatals had lost their palatal value. Thus IE. *ǵst* > Ar. *kʼšt* > *kʼt* and IE. *ǵzd* > Ar. *gʼzd* > *gʼd*. Cf., for the law of dropping sibilants between stops in Sanskrit, Brugmann, Gr. I², § 828 (who, however, does not draw the necessary conclusions about the cases involving IE. palatals). This process is decidedly natural for a language with weak breath stress, where a sibilant between stops is at best weakly pronounced. In the case of the voiced combination we need only remember that the Sanskrit nowhere pronounced a voiced sibilant. The early date of this law appears in the treatment of *rapšʼá-tē* < **rap-ske-*: here the *s* dropped out before the general pronunciation of *ǵ* and its pronunciation in the combination *sǵ* had diverged: i. e. before the former had lost its stop value.

The word *prcchā-ti* (§ 9) may also be an illustration of this law, unless, like Lat. *posco*, we suppose it earlier to have dropped the first *ǵ*.

12. To return to Sk. *kṣ*. When Sanskrit reduced its final consonant groups to simple consonants, final *-kṣ* had to become *-k*.

It is natural, however, that during the operation of the law spoken of in § 11 even final IE. *-ǵs* was affected when it came before stops. Thus **rākʼš tatra* was spoken **rāk tatra*. Such forms as **rākʼ* survived and were spoken alongside the forms in *-k* < *-kṣ*, competing with them, as we shall see, at some advantage.

In historic times forms with final *-k* < IE. palatal were used as follows,—*-kʼ* having everywhere else superseded *-k*:—exclu-

sively in the roots and root-stems *diś'-*, *drś'-*, *spṛś'-*, *ruj-*,¹ *dih-*;² in the stems *śrj-*,³ *bhiṣáj-*,⁴ *ṛtváj-*;⁵ optionally in the root *naś'* 'attain'.⁶

Sporadic instances of forms with final *-k*, where *-k'* has generally been adopted, are the following: (RV.:) *anáḱ* (stem *anáḱṣ-*, cf. *náś'a-ti*), *ámyak* (root *myakṣ-*, cf. *miś'rá-s*); (Vedic:) *prāṇ-adhṛk dadhṛk* (root *drñh-*, cf. Av. *darzayeiti*, Uhlenbeck, l. c., s. v. *dṛhyati*), *puruṣpṛk* (root *spṛh-*, cf. Av. *sparṣ-*, Uhlenbeck, l. c., s. v. *spṛhayati*); (*Māitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā*:) *viśvasrk* (root *srj-*, cf. Av. *hṛzaiti*, Uhlenbeck, l. c., s. v. *srjāti*). Here belong finally the Vedic *s*-aorist forms *asrāk* (root *srj-*) and *adrāk* (root *drś'-*), when used as 2d person sg.

As for the competing forms with *-k'*, they will be spoken of below.

13. At the time of the simplification of final consonant groups final *-k't* (either < IE. *-kēt* or < IE. *-kēst* by the law in § 11) became *-k'*. Thus IE. *-kēt* and *-kēst* always gave *-k'* and IE. *-kēs* sometimes gave *-k'*, sometimes *-k*.

14. At the time of the simplification of final consonant groups IE. *k̂ ĝ* before stops were still uniformly palatal stops *k' g'*. Breath stress in Sanskrit, we may suppose, was too weak for the formation of a spirant or sibilant glide between stops—cf. the earlier dropping of *s* between stops, § 11.

After the time of the simplification of final consonant groups, however, IE. *k̂ ĝ* before *t d, dh* lost their stop articulation. Concretely expressed: the tongue, instead of passing from a vowel position (1) upward to form a palatal stop (2) and then

¹ The final of *ruj-* is not treated in Sanskrit as an IE. palatal, but, wherever the treatment of the two would necessarily differ, as an Ar. velar. Historically, however, the final of *ruj-* is probably an IE. palatal, cf. Lith. *lūstti*, *lūšyti*, Russ. *luznuť*, mentioned by Uhlenbeck, Et. Wb. d. Ai. Spr., s. v. *rujdti*.

² The final of *dih-* is not treated in Sanskrit as an IE. palatal; but cf. Brugmann, Gr. I², § 597, 1.

³ The final of *śrj-* is not treated in Sanskrit as an IE. palatal; historically it is considered such by Brugmann, Gr. I², § 608.

⁴ The final of *bhiṣáj-* is not treated in Sanskrit as an IE. palatal; historically it falls into this class, cf. Brugmann, Gr. I², § 597, 1.

⁵ The final of *ṛtváj-* is not treated in Sanskrit as an IE. palatal; the derivation of the word from the root *yaj-* shows the Sanskrit treatment to be un-historic.

⁶ On the rationale of generalized *k*-forms, cf. Meillet, IF. 18, 418.

A possible case of IĒ. $\hat{k}q$ later $k'k$ shows the same treatment of k' as before dental, namely $\text{ṣikṣa-ti} < *ṣiṣkṣa-ti < *k̂i-k̂q-se-$; cf. above, footnote; Brugmann, Gr. I², §§ 615, 2. 829, Anm. 1; Whitney, l. c., §§ 1030, a. 1040.

(h) Sk. ṣṭ (< IE. $\hat{k}t$): $vāṣṭi$ (Gr. $\epsilon\kappa\acute{o}\nu$).
 (< IE. $\hat{k}st$): $cāṣṭē$ (< IE. $*q\text{ue}k\acute{s}$ -).
 (i) Sk. $-ṣ$ (< IE. $\hat{g}d$): $mṛḍikā-m$ (r long in RV.,
 < IE. $*m\check{r}-\hat{g}d$ -).
 (< IE. $\hat{g}zd$): ṣḍaśa (< IE. $-\hat{g}z-de$ -).

¹As to the inability of the Sanskrit to pronounce voiced sibilants, cf., aside from the historic state of the language, the treatment of IE. *s* (about which some comment will be made below), and the retention of the sibilant in Ar. *sk'* (Sk. *vr̥ścdti*), but not in Ar. *sg'* (Sk. *majjati*).

- (j) Sk. — $\dot{q}h$ (< IE. $\widehat{g}dh$): $\dot{n}\dot{q}h\acute{a}\cdot s$ (< IE. $*\widehat{uegh} + to-$).
 (< IE. $gzdh$): $\dot{\text{ṣ}}\dot{o}\dot{q}h\acute{a}$ (< IE. $*-gz-dh-$).

15. In the position before dentals the IE. palatals have thus coincided in Sanskrit with Ar. ṣ ṣ (< IE. $s z$ after ī, ē, ṛ, r), as in tiṣṭha-ti and miḍhā-m (Av. miždā-m).

16. We have now considered the development of the IE. palatals in the following positions :

- (1) before vowels, semivowels, nasals, and r , to $\text{ṣ } j \text{ } h$ (c) ch (§ 9);
- (2) before preserved sibilants, to k , giving $k\text{ṣ}$ (§ 10);
 - (2a) final $-k\text{ṣ}$ becoming $-k$ (§ 12),
 - (2b) or, before initial stops, $-k'$ (§§ 11, 12);
- (3) before dental stops (or sibilants + dental stops), to $k' g'$, giving $k't g'd(h)$ (§ 11);
 - (3a) final $-k't$ becoming $-k'$ (§§ 11, 13),
 - (3b) $k't$ and $g'd(h)$ otherwise becoming ṣṭ and $—\dot{q}(h)$ (§ 14).
- (4) before velars the treatment of palatals was probably the same as before dentals (§ 14).

17. Before labial stops, where palatals were followed by closure of the lips, inaction of the tongue, and stoppage of the breath current, these sounds suffered no change, but remained as $k' g'$, the former coinciding with the $-k'$ of § 12 and of § 13. Hence we may say that in all these cases the Sanskrit retained the IE. palatals until a late prehistoric time at a stage which, so far, we have represented by $k' g'$ —meaning thereby to indicate stopped consonants articulated with the “middle part” of the tongue (*Zungenrücken*) against a point of the palate forward of the $k g$ point, and pronounced without spirant vanish.¹

¹ By this time, needless to say, Sk. c and j from whatever source had become $\text{ṣ } \text{ṣ'}$,—stops with a spirant glide, formed very near the “dental” points of tongue and palate.

In historic Sanskrit these $k' g'$ sounds are uniformly represented by the so-called “cerebrals” or “linguals” written $\text{ṭ } \dot{q}$. Whitney, l. c., § 45, says: “The lingual mutes are by all native authorities defined as uttered with the tip of the tongue turned up and drawn back into the dome of the palate (somewhat as the usual English smooth r is pronounced”). They are (§ 46) “perhaps derived from the aboriginal languages of India”.

We have here most probably a case of sound substitution. It is easy to see how a people unaccustomed to hearing correctly or articulating sounds formed with the middle tongue against the dome of the palate, would substitute "linguals" for these sounds. The difference in the place of articulation would be slight if any; the change would be only in the manner: instead of bringing the dorsal surface of the tongue against the palate, the Hindu articulated with the tip. Examples:

- (k) Sk. *ṭ* (< IE. *ḱ*): *viṭ-pāti-ṣ* (historic form, beside *viś'-pāti-ṣ*).
 (< IE. *-ḱs*): *rāṭ tatra* (< **rēḱs t-*).
 (< IE. *-ḱst*): *avāṭ* (= *a-vāḱṣīt* Lat. *vexil*, formed without the connecting *i*).
 (< IE. *ḱt*): *ānaṭ* (root *naś'-* + *t*).
 (l) Sk. *ḍ* (< IE. *ǵ*) *viḍbhyās* (dat. abl. pl. of *viś'-*, GAv. *vižibyo*).

18. The occurrence of *ṭ ḍ* for older *ḱ g'* (< *ḱ ǵ*) is strictly phonetic, then, (1) before labials (2) finally where a following *-t* or *-ṣt* have been dropped, and (3) finally where a following *-ṣ* has been dropped before initial stops. Accordingly we should inflect as follows, e. g., the noun stem *viś'-* (IE. *uik-* Av. *vis-*):

Nom. sg. *viṭ* (before stops, otherwise :) **vik*,
 loc. pl. *vikṣū*,
bh-cases *viḍbhyām*, *viḍbhiṣ*, *viḍbhyās*,
 other cases *viś'am*, *viś'ā*, *viś'ī*, etc.

Most noun stems ending in IE. palatals differ from *viś'-* in forming the loc. pl. with analogic *ṭ* for *ḱ*, e. g., *-liṭsu* from *-lih-*. In the later language *viṭsu* is the loc. pl. of *viś'-*: the long survival of the phonetic *vikṣū* being due probably to frequency of use. The complete victory of *-ṭ* over *-ḱ* in the nom. sg. is due mostly to the analogy of the *bh*-cases, though the occurrence of *-ṭ* before initial stops no doubt gave the start. A few isolated and rare *-ḱ* forms are quoted in § 12, end: these sporadic survivals in the literature may well be the reflex of a usage common in the spoken language. The forms *ṣāṭ* and *ṣaṭsu* of the numeral *ṣa(ḱ)ṣ-* also show victory of the *-ṭ* form.

On the other hand, the nouns named in § 12 as having *-ḱ* in the nom. sg. have extended this sound to exclusive use. They

also have retained, like *viś'*-, the *k*-form in the loc. pl. On the basis of these two forms they have then substituted velar forms for the *ḍ* of the *bh*-cases, e. g. *dr̥gbhiṣ*. In the case of the radical noun from the root *ruj*- and of the other nouns in *-j* (< IE. *g*) mentioned in § 12, this process left no distinction between these nouns and the nouns in *-j* (< IE. *g*, *gʷ*)—whose influence of course came into play in all these cases.

In verb forms the peculiar combinations made by IE. palatals plus dental endings have helped to keep the roots in IE. palatals distinct. The roots *ruj*- and *dih*-, however, which are treated as if their finals represented IE. velars or labiovelars, are probably the victims of analogic transference, cf. the notes in § 12. On the other hand the root *bhraj*- is treated (in its few forms, e. g., pple. *bhr̥ṣṭá-s*) as if its final were an IE. palatal; its cognates however show plainly that its final is not of this class: e. g., CSl. *obr̥zgnati*, cf. Uhlenbeck, l. c., s. v. *bhr̥jjāti*. Note also such formations as *mūḍhá*- for *mugdhá*- and finally the transference to palatal conjugation of the root *ruh*- with IE. *-dh*.

Single verb forms with *-ṭ* for *-k* or *vice versa* are also found. Thus the root aorist and *s*-aorist of roots in IE. palatals ought to form the 2d person sg. in *-k* or *-ṭ* (< older *-kṣ* or *-kʷṣ* before stops) and the 3d person sg. in *-ṭ* (< older *-kʷt* or *-kʷst*). As a matter of fact the *-k* forms quoted in § 12, end, (*adrāk*, *asrāk*) with *nak* (from *naś'* 'attain') and *rōk* (from *ruj*-) and the *-ṭ* forms *ānaṭ* (*naś'* 'attain'), *aprāṭ*, *abhrāṭ*, *ayāṭ*, *asrāṭ* are used indifferently for the two persons. The forms *ayās* and *srās* occur twice each for the 2d person sg.; the latter form is explained by Bartholomae as belonging to a 3d sg. **srāt* with *-t* for *-ṭ* through dissimilation by the preceding *r*. *Ayās* is probably quite unphonetic: the analogic relationship is well explained by Whitney, l. c., § 555, a.

Such forms as *uḍḍhi* for **uḍhi* (< **uḡ-dhi*), imperative of *vaś'*-, are formed on the model of *dug-dhi* and the like, with the feeling that *-ś'* before *-dh* as before *-bh* ought to give *-ḍ*. *ṣaḍ-ḍhā* *ṣaḍ-dhā* for *ṣōḍhā* (< **eḡz-dh*-) are of course of similar origin.

19. To sum up, our theory of the IE. palatals in Sanskrit is as follows. IE. *ḱ* etc. are, in accordance with the standard view, which is based on phonetic likelihood, supposed to have been slightly palatalized velar stops.—(1) In Aryan (i. e. before the palatalization of IE. velars and labiovelars and before the subsequent change of IE. *ḱ*, *ḡ* > *ḱ*) there were two dialects: the

Iranian with strong spirant tendency, which developed IE. \hat{k} etc. so rapidly that the new Ar. palatals could not coincide with them; and the Indic which spirantized \hat{k} etc. less rapidly, so that, while IE. \hat{k} never coincided with the new Ar. palatals, IE. \hat{g} and $\hat{g}h$ did. Before vowels, semivowels, nasals, and r IE. \hat{k} \hat{g} $\hat{g}h$ became Sanskrit \check{s} j h .—Before stops and sibilants they at first remained k' g' . After the dropping of sibilants between stops, $k's$ became Sanskrit $k\check{s}$.—The simplification of final consonant groups reduced $-k\check{s}$ to Sanskrit $-k$ and $-k't$ to $-k'$.—Now $k't$ everywhere became $\check{s}t$ and $g'd(h)$ everywhere became $-d(h)$.—(2) Finally k' and g' (which now remained only in final position and before labial stops) became t and d .

20. Having constructed our edifice we must now defend it. The two points most liable to objection from the viewpoint of the current theory are above marked as (1) and (2). We shall now consider these points.

21. As to point (1), we must observe that we have determined no anterior limit, chronologically, to the state of things there described. The "dialectic" difference between Iranian and Indic in the treatment of the IE. palatals may date back—and probably does date back—to the time when the IE. dialects first began to diverge in their pronunciation of these sounds.

The objection to (1) then will be: How is it possible that of the Aryan sister languages, which long formed a unit, making in common many changes of pronunciation, flexion, use of forms, vocabulary, etc., one should be a thorough-going *satəm* language, the other far from that and almost a *centum* language?

We may answer that this is not only possible, but that this our view is decidedly in accordance with the results of modern investigation. When we say that Iranian and Indic in common changed IE. \check{z} , $\check{\delta}$ to \check{a} , but even before that time—and indeed from the Indo-European time—diverged in the pronunciation of the IE. palatals, we are only implying that two successive sound changes, though in part coinciding as to territory, may be topographically of different extent. Iranian and Indic were mutually intelligible dialects in Aryan times, although the old *centum-satəm* sound change had left some difference between them. So the Italic, for instance, agrees in a number of developments with the Celtic and in a number with the Greek. *A priori* it is, in fact, much more likely that one of the so-called *satəm* languages should differ somewhat from the others in its treatment of the

palatals, than that the eastern languages and the western languages should be cut apart like two halves of a cheese.

Such a division as that between *centum* and *satəm* languages has value only as a description or classification of actual facts. As the Sanskrit does not actually represent the IE. palatals by sibilants, but only partly so and mostly by palatal, velar, and lingual stops, the burden of proof rests entirely on those who wish to class Sanskrit with the sibilant languages and insist that the Sanskrit sibilants are hidden behind the historic Sanskrit stops.

22. This brings us to the second point of objection. We have supposed that in certain positions the IE. palatals remained palatalized velar stops in Indic until shortly before the historic time, when they were changed to the Sanskrit lingual stops. In other words, we assumed a sound substitution $k' g' > t d$ where the current view supposes a development of $k' g' > ʃ ʒ > t d$. Aside from the methodic consideration that it is unnecessary to suppose such a roundabout development as the latter, our chief argument was that a development from $ʃ ʒ$ to $t d$, or in general from sibilants to stops is improbable and unparalleled.

The objection may be urged, now, that this development is paralleled in Sanskrit, that the IE. sibilants in Sanskrit sometimes appear as lingual and as dental stops. Let us consider these phenomena and attempt to divine their meaning.¹

We must note, first, that the actual representation of IE. sibilants and of IE. palatals does in one set of cases universally coincide: namely, the IE. palatals before dental stops coincide with Ar. $ʃ ʒ$ in the same position (cf. § 15).

Secondly we must note that the following representations of IE. sibilants as stops are rare in the older language. If in some cases the analogies involved seem indirect, we must remember that they were not made any oftener than this would lead us to expect. The representations in question become regular only after the grammarians, who naturally were struck by what seemed to them decided and peculiar sound-changes, prescribed them as correct.

¹To avoid constant reference to the divergent view we may here refer to Brugmann's *Grundriss I*², §§ 819-830. 1005, 5. 1007, 11. Examples are taken from Brugmann and from Whitney, l. c., §§ 164-168, b. 172. 172, a. 225-226, f. 612, b. 617, b. 620, b.

Thus when we find a few cases in the older language of \check{s} before s in inflection "becoming" k , so as to give $k\check{s}$, the explanation is obvious:— $vá\check{s}ti$: $vák\check{s}i$ = $vivē\check{s}ti$: $vivēk\check{s}i$. Similarly, Vedic 2d and 3d sg. $piṇak$ as if from a palatal root.

So obvious is this explanation that even some advocates of the prevalent view have decided to adopt it, although giving up the change $\check{s} > k$ forces the corollary that IE. \hat{k} \hat{g} before sibilants at least never quite became sibilants, but were "Ar. χ γ ".

The second supposed change of sibilants to stops is that to linguals. Final $-\check{s}$ (IE. $-s$ + $-s$ of nom. sg. or $-s$, $-t$ as verb endings) appears in a few old cases as $-t$. Later this is considered regular, and the final $-\check{s}$ of radical noun stems appears as $-t$ $-q$ also before the endings $-su$ and $-bh$ -, e. g. $dvi\check{s}am$, $dvi\check{t}$, $dvi\check{s}u$, $dviqbhi\check{s}$; imperfect tense: $advē\check{s}am$, $advē\check{t}$, $advē\check{t}$.

The standard view wisely leaves $dvi\check{t}$, $advē\check{t}$ out of play; $dvi\check{s}u$ is allowed to be unoriginal; but $dviqbhi\check{s}$ is considered the regular phonetic development of $*dvi\check{s}-bhi\check{s}$. From this $dvi\check{t}$, etc., developed.

The facts of the language are decidedly against this view. The prefix $du\check{s}$ - nowhere changes its final to a stop, lingual or other; similarly the adverb $sajñ\check{s}$. The change of $-\check{s}$ to t q occurs "only once in RV. and once in AV. ($-dvi\check{t}$ and $-pru\check{t}$), although those texts have more than 40 roots with final $-\check{s}$; in the Brahmanas, moreover, have been noticed further only $-pru\check{t}$ and $vi\check{t}$ ŠB.), and $-ś'li\check{t}$ (K.)". On the other hand we still meet in RV. $vivē\check{s}$ and $ā-vivē\check{s}$ from $vi\check{s}$ - and perhaps a few other cases, cf. Whitney, l. c., §§ 225, a. 226, d. Even in the later language most cases of final $-\check{s}$ fall into the class of $havi\check{s}$ - ($havi\check{r}$ $āsti$, $havis$ $ti\check{s}t\check{h}ati$, etc., $havi\check{r}bhi\check{s}$, $havi\check{s}ṣu$ or $haviḥṣu$). Our judgment has been too much under the spell of the traditional descriptive grammar, which naturally emphasizes the most striking changes. It was the similarity of $vá\check{s}ti$ to $dvē\check{s}ti$ (and later of $vák\check{s}i$ to $dvēk\check{s}i$) that caused $advē\check{t}$ to be formed like $áva\check{t}$. In the case of the nouns the necessity was felt that a root noun, in the nom. sg., before $-bh$, and before $-su$, had to have a stop. Owing to forms like $advē\check{t}$ the stop thought of was the lingual. Otherwise expressed: as \check{s}' gave in various connections $\check{s}t$, $k\check{s}$, t , ts , qbh , \check{s} , which also gave $\check{s}t$ was made to give $k\check{s}$, and later t , ts , qbh . Note further such parallels as $lēk\check{s}i$ with the new $dvēk\check{s}i$ and $āliqbhvam$ with (s -aor.) $astōqbhvam$. When the feeling had

arisen that the stop form of \check{s} was $t\ d$, forms like *dvidḍhi* and forms and spellings like *dvidḍhvam* arose, cf. *udḍhi*, § 18, end, and Brugmann, Gr. I², § 830, Anm. 2.

23. Parallel to forms with $k\check{s}$ from roots in $-s$ are a few forms with ts from roots with $-s$, as fut. *vatsyāmi* from *vas-*, desid. *jighatsa* from *ghas-*. The regular treatment would have given **vassyāmi*, etc., or **vaḥsyāmi*, etc. (similarly pronounced), which were not felt as s -forms; hence imitation of the nearest lying combination of stops + s , as in *patsyāmi*. There is no need of any such far-fetched explanation as change of s to t before s , or development of a stop within ss .

Again, parallel to the supposed change of $-s$ to $-t\ -d$ a change of $-s$ to $-d$ is considered phonetic in the Vedic *mādbhiḥ*, etc., from *mās-* and *uṣādbhiḥ* from *uṣās-*; but there is no reason for abandoning Whitney's explanation of these forms as substitution of t -stem forms for s -stem forms. Whitney adduces the parallel case of the perf. act. pple.; and, in general, inflection from several stems is so characteristic of the older stages of IE. languages that these ancient and rare forms also are best looked upon as survivals. Cf. for the rest Goth. *mēnōps* and the relation Sk. *yákr̥t*, *yakn-ās* : Lat. *jec-in-or-is*.

There is further one word stem in which IE. z is said to have given Sk. d : *madgúḥ*-, cf. Lat. *mergus*, which belong to Sk. *májja-ti*, Lith. *mazgóti*. First note that the jj in *májja-ti* is pronounced $d'd'$ (with a slight glide), cf. $jj < d + j$ in *taj jalām*. This $d'd'$ is, as we have seen, parallel to $(c)ch$ (the first c serves, of course, only to indicate that ch is a *double* consonant, not a mere aspirate), except that in this combination, pronounced $t's'$, the s' corresponds to the second d' of the voiced combination, where sibilant could not be pronounced. Just as $sk' (= s\hat{k}) > s'k'h > s'k'\chi' > \check{s}'t's' > t's'$, so in the voiced combination zg' , with slower development, $zg' > z'g'h >$ (some such thing as) $d'y' > d'd'$. Now the noun **mazgu-* regularly $> *mēgu-$, for which *madgú-* was formed from *májja-ti* just as *tād gácchati* corresponds to *taj jagāma* or, practically, as *tyāgá-s* corresponds to *tyájati*.

Thus it appears that the alleged developments of sibilants to Sanskrit stops are in no case instances of phonetic change.

NOTE on the IE. "sonant aspirates". In the above discussion the treatment of IE, $\check{g}h$ was brought up as little as possible,

owing to the uncertainty which surrounds the nature of the IE. "sonant aspirates". We shall here recall a few of the properties of these sounds as indicated by their development in the various IE. languages and then show that our view of the development of the IE. palatals in Sanskrit is consistent with the development of IE. $\hat{g}h$ to voiced h .

(1) The stop element in the IE. "voiced aspirates" was voiced, as a preceding voiceless stop is assimilated. The second element or "aspiration" cannot be pronounced before an immediately following stop, but is left until the stop or stops have been articulated, and is then uttered: in the meantime the glottis is not opened, i. e., the voice continues, as in "assimilation" of surds to sonants,—showing the "aspiration" to have been a voiced sound. In Sanskrit when the stop element is absent the sound uttered is a "voiced h " (*stimmhafter Hauch*). We may, then, provisionally ascribe to the "sonant aspirates" the value of a stop closely followed by a voiced breathing—a volume of breath being sent through the open mouth sufficient to be audible as an aspiration (*Hauch*), but not sufficient to necessitate greater opening of the glottis than is consistent with voicing.

(2) The inherent difficulty of pronouncing these sounds is due to the general fact that a delicately graded or "halfway" muscular movement is harder to make than a decided or "all the way" one. Hence the instability of these sounds. They are preserved only in the highly conservative and ancient Sanskrit. In Germanic they were preserved up to the time of the sound-shifting, when they were changed by the strong breath stress, which probably assimilated the stop element to the succeeding spirant element. Sanskrit and Germanic alone kept the "sonant aspirates" apart from the other classes of stops.¹

(3) In Greek and Italic a total opening of the glottis was substituted for the delicately graded opening with voice continuation. Thus the aspiration became voiceless and the stop was assimilated to it. Similar is the result when an English-speaking person first tries to pronounce a "sonant aspirate" as above described, or a Čechish voiced h .

(4) The other IE. languages substituted ordinary vibration of the vocal chords for the period of more open vibration: or, from

¹ This conservative phonetic character of Germanic among the IE. languages is general, cf. a forthcoming paper by Dr. E. Prokosch.

another point of view, they assimilated the voiced aspiration to the following action of the vocal chords.

(5) The difficulty of pronouncing these sounds affects even Sanskrit. In the passage from vowel to stop to "breathing" the (lip or) tongue had to make its stop articulation rapidly: and this rapid action had to be made most rapidly exactly where it is most difficult, in the back of the mouth. Hence we find *h* for *bh* less frequently than *h* for *dh*; and, could we distinguish the cases of *h* for *gh* from those of *h* for (historic or analogic) *g'h*, there is no doubt that we should find them more numerous than the preceding. In the case of *g'h* (< IE. *ǵh* and Ar. *g'h*) the difficulty of pronunciation was by far greatest, as the middle tongue had to be raised to the highest part of the palate—an articulation nowhere retained in Sanskrit. Hence we find here universal loss of the stop and retention of voiced *h*.

LEONARD BLOOMFIELD.

III.—THE INTRODUCTION OF MASKS ON THE ROMAN STAGE.¹

If ancient testimony concerning the introduction of masks on the Roman stage were as consistent as it is abundant, one of the troublesome problems in the history of the Roman theater would never have arisen. The passage most often quoted on the subject is from Diomedes² (Keil, Gramm. Lat., i. 489): *antea itaque galearibus, non personis utebantur, ut qualitas coloris indicium faceret aetatis, cum essent albi aut nigri aut rufi. Personis vero uti primus coepit Roscius Gallus, praecipuus histrio, quod oculis perversis³ erat nec satis decorus in personis⁴ nisi parasitus pronuntiabat.* The uncertainties of the text in this passage seem not to affect the plain statement that Roscius was the first to begin the use of masks among the Romans.⁵ It is, therefore,

¹In a recent attempt to bring together all the available evidence concerning Costume in Roman Comedy (Columbia University Press, 1909) I was obliged by the large amount of material involved to omit a discussion of the use of masks. From time to time various phases of this question have been treated in special papers and dissertations, but a convenient and complete summary of the present status of the question I have been unable to discover, even in van Wageningen, *Scaenica Romana* (Groningen, 1907). Such a summary I have attempted to give in this paper, with appropriate comment.

²Diomedes's sources seem to have been Suetonius and Varro (see Teuffel-Schwabe, *Röm. Lit.*, i^b. 29; Ribbeck, *Röm. Trag.* 661). Cf. the parallel passages in Suetonius (Reifferscheid, *Reliquiae*, p. 11): both Suetonius and Diomedes quote Varro in their discussion of *comoedia*, of which these two passages form a part.

³*Eversis A B M, obversis S: perversis scripsit Keilius ex Cic. de Nat. Deor. I 28. 79 at erat (Roscius), sicut hodie est, oculis perversissimis.*

⁴*Nec satis decorus nisi personatus* coniecit Reuversius *Collect. Litt.* p. 10 *sine personis* Langius *Vind. Trag. Rom.* p. 43. Hofferus (*De Personarum Usu in Comoediis Terenti*, p. 10) *sine personis* legit, Suetonium (l. c.) secutus. *Nisi om. M.*

⁵At least, no such uncertainty is indicated by Keil. However, Naumann says (*De Personarum Usu in Terentii Comoediis*, p. 3): *Sed quoniam totus ille locus (i. e., apud Diomedem) in codicibus misere corruptus est, quam errorem a Diomede ad Suetonium a Suetonio ad Varronem referre hominemque doctissimum et diligentissimum manifestae insimulare negligentiae, multo*

most natural to expect further evidence on the subject from the actor's distinguished pupil, Cicero, and scholars have collected from the orator's works at least four passages which bear more or less directly on the matter.

In *De Oratore* 3. 59. 221 Crassus is made to say: *sed in ore sunt omnia. In eo autem ipso dominatus est omnis oculorum: quo melius nostri illi senes, qui personatum ne Roscium quidem magno opere laudabant.* That is, Crassus, speaking in 91 B. C., refers to the old men of the time as having refused to approve even Roscius, when he acted *personatus*. It seems a fair inference that to these disapproving *senes* the use of masks was an innovation: but as Naumann speedily pointed out (l. c., p. 2), by no means inevitable is Hoffer's further inference (l. c., pp. 4-7) that this unpopular innovation had crystallized into uniform practice by 91 B. C. or even by 55 B. C. (the probable date of the composition of the *De Oratore*). However, in confirmation of this view, Hoffer proceeds to cite another passage from the *De Oratore* (2. 46. 193), where Cicero warns the orator that he must himself feel the emotion which he desires to excite: *Sed, ut dixi, ne hoc in nobis <= nobis oratoribus> mirum videatur, quid potest esse tam fictum quam versus, quam scaena, quam fabulae? Tamen in hoc genere saepe ipse vidi ut ex persona mihi ardere oculi hominis histrionis viderentur, etc.* Again, the inference that the use of the mask was uniform when these words were written is tempting but unjustifiable.¹ Even less satisfactory for Hoffer's purpose are the words in *De Div.* 1. 37. 80: *Quid vestra oratio in*

probabilius est inter coepit et Roscius olim Minucium Prothymum et Cincium Faliscum, quos Donatus de Com. extr. primos tradit fabulas personatos egisse, fuisse nominatos Naumann seems here to have confused the passage from Diomedes with the parallel passage from Suetonius, the latter of which is preceded and followed by lacunae.

¹ It may further be objected that this passage, as, probably, the next (*De Div.* 1. 37. 80) also, has reference to tragedy and not to comedy. From the available evidence it seems impossible to say whether masks were introduced earlier at Rome on the comic or on the tragic stage. Ribbeck argues (*Röm. Trag.* 660-662; 672) that masks were first used on the tragic stage, but he has probably misinterpreted his evidence in this respect (see below p. 61, especially n. 6). In the Festus passage discussed below, pp. 64-5, *comoedi* are mentioned before *tragoedi* and in Euanthius (*De Com.* VI. 3) comedy is mentioned before tragedy: but that order is perhaps not significant, especially since it is probable that in the Euanthius passage the names of the innovators have been reversed.

causis? quid ipsa actio? potest esse vehemens, et gravis, et copiosa, nisi est animus ipse commotior? Equidem etiam in te saepe vidi et (ut ad leviora veniamus) in Aesopo familiari tuo tantum ardorem vultuum atque motuum, ut eum vis quaedam abstraxisse a sensu mentis videretur. Now, this passage is generally cited to show that the use of masks was *not* constant in Cicero's time, but Hoffer disposes of the obvious difficulty by suggesting (1) that Aesopus's mask might have been so constructed as to depict his excited mental state, *vultus* thus being used in a transferred sense, or (2) that Quintus, having in mind at the outset not so much the actor's as the orator's action, suddenly turns the course of his thought aside to Aesopus and applies to the actor what he had intended to apply only to Cicero.

The fourth and last of the important passages from Cicero is to be found in *De Nat. Deor.* i. 28. 79: Q. Catulus, huius collegae et familiaris nostri pater, dilexit municipem tuum Roscium; in quem etiam illud est eius

Constiteram exorientem Auroram forte salutans
Cum subito a laeva Roscius exoritur.
Pace mihi liceat, caelestes, dicere vestra;
Mortalis visust pulchrior esse deo.

Huic deo pulchrior: at erat, sicuti hodie est, perversissimis oculis. Quid refert, si hoc ipsum salsum illi et venustum videbatur? The assumption that Roscius is here described as acting on the stage seems to me to be unwarranted,¹ but Hoffer so interprets the situation,² and concludes that when this epigram was written Roscius could not have adopted the habit of playing *personatus*; furthermore, the generation of the elder Catulus³ would fit in well with that of the disapproving *senes* in *De Orat.* 3. 59. 221.

If our evidence stopped here with the testimony of Cicero, Suetonius and Diomedes, we might regret its incompleteness, but, at least we should not be troubled by any glaring incon-

¹ There is a bare possibility that Roscius, if not here represented as acting on the stage, is practising without a mask for the stage, since he is cited by Valerius Maximus (8. 7. 7) as one of the great men of history who were examples of *studium* and *industria*, inasmuch as he employed no gesture in public performances which he had not practised at home.

² This view seems probable to Ribbeck also: see *Röm. Trag.* 671, n. 136.

³ This Catulus died in the Marian proscription in 87 B. C.

sistency. However, quite as positive as the statements which Suetonius and Diomedes make concerning Roscius are three other statements of Donatus and Euanthius, which not only contradict the assertion of Suetonius and Diomedes but even disagree among themselves.¹ The first comes from the *locus classicus* of our knowledge of Roman stage presentations, Euanthius de Comoedia (VI. 3.): Personati primi egisse dicuntur comoediam Cincius Faliscus, tragoediam Minucius Prothymus. The second is from Donatus, Praef. ad Eun. 6: Acta plane est ludis Megalensibus L. Postumio L. Cornelio aedilibus curulibus,² agentibus etiam tunc personatis L. Minucio Prothymo L. Ambivio Turpione, item modulante Flacco Claudii tibiis dextra et sinistra ob iocularia multa permixta gravitati. The third passage is from another Praefatio of Donatus—that of the Adelphoe (6): haec sane acta est ludis scaenicis funebribus L. Aemili Pauli³ agentibus L. Ambivio et L. <Minucio Prothymo>,⁴ qui cum suis gregibus etiam tum personati agebant.

In the first passage (Euanthius de Com. VI. 3) the writer seems to have reversed the provinces of Cincius Faliscus and Minucius Prothymus, for the second passage and probably the third also associate the latter with comedy.⁵ The connection of Minucius Prothymus with the introduction of masks Ribbeck (Röm. Trag., 660-661) proposed to reconcile with Diomedes's statement by suggesting that Minucius Prothymus may have been the stage-manager under whom Roscius first acted *personatus*.⁶ Such a supposition seemed not impossible, for Dziatzko

¹ If all attempts to reconcile the testimony of Donatus and Euanthius with that of Cicero, Suetonius and Diomedes prove unsuccessful, the latter should certainly have the greater claim on our confidence, especially if Diomedes and Suetonius go back ultimately to Varro (cf. above, p. 58, n. 2). See, however, van Wageningen, *Scaenica Romana*, p. 35: Nobis difficile est hanc solvere quaestionem atque diiudicare utri maior fides habenda sit, Diomedian Donato, quod uterque locuples auctor est.

² In 161 B. C.

³ In 160 B. C.

⁴ *Minucio Prothymo* supplevit Wilmanns: * * * * * V, om. A C.

⁵ See Schanz, *Röm. Literaturgesch.*,² Müller's *Hdb.* VIII. I. 1, 200 (1906), and van Wageningen, *Scaenica Romana*, pp. 34-35.

⁶ It was, however, in Ribbeck's opinion the *tragic* stage on which Roscius and Minucius Prothymus introduced the use of masks. His authority seems to be, apart from the passage above cited from Euanthius (De Com. VI. 3), the tradition that Roscius, though especially fine in comedy, was also a successful actor of tragedy (Röm. Trag., 661 ff.; 108). But his great pre-

had shown that Minucius Prothymus brought out the *Adelphoe* in post-Terentian times (Rh. Mus. 20. 589, 591) and Ribbeck (Röm. Trag., 661) regards Minucius Prothymus as belonging most probably to the period of Accius.¹ If we grant this date for Minucius Prothymus, the only other difficulty with Ribbeck's explanation is that it seems to leave unaccounted for the mention of Ambivius Turpio, which Donatus makes in both the Praefationes above quoted; but this difficulty is obviated, if, again, we agree with Dziatzko (Rh. Mus. 21. 68, 82) that the three actors mentioned in connection with each play in the Donatus Praefationes and in the Terentian Didascaliae² had to do with *different* presentations of the respective plays. Hoffer suggests that in the beginning the introduction of masks was probably assigned to Minucius Prothymus alone and only later to Ambivius Turpio, when the names of the successive managers had been confused in Praefationes and Didascaliae.³ He adds, as further evidence that Ambivius Turpio could hardly have employed masks, the words from Cicero De Sen. 48⁴ to the effect that Ambivius especially delighted the spectators *in prima cavea*, a thing which Hoffer regards as very unlikely, in the light of De Orat. 3. 59. 221, if Ambivius Turpio had played *personatus*. But here, again, Hoffer is interpreting the text arbitrarily to suit his purpose, for the delight of the audience *in prima cavea* may have been due simply to *hearing* Roscius better; or, if the

eminence in comedy (see Quint. 11. 1. 3.), along with the distinct mention of the rôle of the parasite, seems to indicate that comedy was certainly not *less* in the mind of Diomedes than was tragedy. See above, p. 59, n. 1.

¹ Leo, speaking of Atilius Praenestinus as the probable successor of L. Ambivius Turpio in the production of Terence's plays (Rh. Mus. 38, 242), adds: "Dass Minucius Prothymus jünger war ist eine durchaus gerechtfertigte Annahme".

² Egere L. Ambivius Turpio L. Atilius Praen.—Didascalia Eunuchi
Egere L. Atilius Praen. L. Ambivius Turpio.—Didascalia Adelphorum.

³ Similar is the view of Leo (Rh. Mus. 38. 343), though his grounds are different; "Mir will scheinen, dass Donat sich durch sein 'etiam tum' selbst verräth. Ihm ist das richtige bekannt, aber er fühlt sich durch irgend einen andern Umstand zu einem trügerischen Schluss veranlasst. So ist die Antwort gegeben: Donat kannte die Scenenbilder, in denen die Schauspieler maskirt dargestellt u. denen die Maskengruppen vorausgeschickt sind, er schloss aus den Illustrationen auf die Zeit des Dichters".

⁴ Turpione Ambivio magis delectatur qui in prima cavea spectat, delectatur tamen etiam qui in ultima The date of this dialogue is supposed to be 150 B. C.

literal meaning of *spectat* is insisted upon, it may have been merely his gestures and general bearing which they delighted to watch and not necessarily his facial expression (cf. *De Orat.* i. 59. 251).

✓ Ribbeck's attempt to reconcile the introduction of masks by Roscius with Donatus's statements about Minucius Prothymus had apparently been generally accepted as the best explanation available until recently, when van Wageningen (*Scaenica Romana*, pp. 35-41) protested against the idea that these actors were contemporaries. His argument runs as follows: Ambivius Turpio was an old man in 160 B. C., when he spoke the prologue of the *Hecyra*,¹ though he was still acting most acceptably to his audiences in 150 B. C.² Supposing him to have died shortly after this and Atilius Praenestinus, his successor in presenting Terence's plays, to have flourished about twenty years (150 B. C.—130 B. C.), Minucius Prothymus, who succeeded Atilius, ought probably to be assigned to the years 130–110 B. C. Now, the *senes* to whom Crassus refers in 91 B. C. probably saw players acting without masks about forty years before,³ i. e. in the neighborhood of 131 B. C., which would easily allow the introduction of masks to fall into the period assumed for Minucius Prothymus (130–110 B. C.). But Roscius, who died a *senex* in 63 or 62 B. C.,⁴ was probably born about 135 B. C., in which case he could hardly have made any great innovation on the stage before 115 B. C. Even if we grant this chronology of van Wageningen, which is almost pure speculation, it does not make impossible Ribbeck's theory that Roscius may have been, for a time at least, in the *grex* of Minucius Prothymus; but van Wageningen believes that there is ground to suppose that Minucius Prothymus introduced masks at Rome much earlier than 115 B. C.—viz. about 130 B. C. He bases his opinion on a passage from Tacitus (*Ann.* 14. 21),⁵ where it is said that the *ludi* were especially elaborate

¹ Orator ad vos venio ornatu prologi:

sinite exorator sim, eodem ut iure uti *senem*
liceat, quo iure sum usus adolescentior.

—Hec. Prol. 9-11.

² See p. 62, n. 4.

³ See below, p. 71, n. 2.

⁴ Cic. *Pro Archia*, 17.

⁵ *Maiores quoque non abhorruisse spectaculorum oblectamentis pro fortuna quae tum erat, eoque a Tuscis accitos histriones, a Thuriis equorum certamina: et possessa Achaia Asiaque ludos curatius editos, nec quemquam*

after the conquests of Achaia (146 B. C.) and of Asia (130 B. C.), theatrical representations being expressly mentioned in connection with the brilliant triumph of L. Mummius in 145 B. C. Along with the plunder brought from the East after these conquests were numerous slaves, many of whom were not improbably actors. And so van Wageningen suggests that Minucius Prothymus, with his Greek *cognomen* and his possible floruit of 130–110 B. C., was the *Greek manager* who attempted to introduce masks at Rome, but that not until a *Roman actor*, Roscius, adopted the custom was it really accepted by the Romans, in whose minds, therefore, Roscius stood as the real innovator.

There remains to be considered one other general statement by Donatus—a comment on *Andria* IV. 3. 1: *haec scaena administrationem doli habet, quo fit ut deterreatur Chremes filiam suam Pamphilo dare. Et vide non minimas partes in hac comoedia Mysidi attribui, hoc est personae femineae, sive haec personatis viris agitur, ut apud veteres, sive per mulierem, ut nunc videmus.* The evidence to be derived from this passage depends, of course, on the interpretation of *apud veteres*, a phrase which Hoffer says (p. 32), judging from its use in other Donatus passages, may refer to any period before the time of Augustus. It is also true that Tacitus (*Dial.* 15–19) and Quintilian (9. 3. 1) use *veteres* and *antiqui* in opposition to *nostri* (contemporaneous writers), much as we set ‘classical’ or ‘ante-classical’ over against ‘post-classical’.¹ Hence, the comment of Donatus avails equally little for those who claim, with Hoffer, that masks were introduced between the time of Terence and that of Cicero, and for those who think that even in Plautus’s day masks were used by men when they played women’s parts. The scales might be turned in favor of the later date by a passage from Festus, if only we could trust Mueller’s reading² but the *quaedam Naevi* of

Romae honesto loco ortum ad theatrales artes degeneravisse, ducentis iam annis a L. Mummii triumpho qui primus id genus spectaculi in urbe prae-buerit. Sed et consultum parsimoniae quod perpetua sedes theatro locata sit potius quam immenso sumptu singulos per annos consurgeret ac destrueretur.

¹ See *Archaism in Aulus Gellius*, by Professor Charles Knapp, *Drisler Studies*, pp. 129–132.

² *Personata fabula quaedam Naevi inscribitur, quam putant quidam primum a personatis histrionibus. sed cum post multos annos comoedi et tragoedi personis uti coeperunt, verisimilius est eam fabulam propter inopiam comedorum actam novam per Atellanos, qui proprie vocantur personati, quia ius*

Mueller's text is so far uncertain that Thewrewk de Ponor reads merely *quaedam ne ut*¹ (*Personata fabula quaedam ne ut in-scribitur, quam putant quidam primum† a personatis histrionibus*).

In view of the uncertain results yielded by all the passages which we have thus far considered, Hoffer set to work to examine the Donatus commentary in detail, collecting from it eighty passages (l. c., pp. 23-30) which seemed to him to show that a change of facial expression was being suggested by the scholiast. There is, however, grave question as to the value of some of these passages for Hoffer's argument. Thus, the literal meaning of *vultuose* can hardly be pressed in view of comments like that on *And. I. 2. 13* (*more servili et vernili gestu: sic enim vocati a dominis secum vultuose agunt*) or that on *And. II. 1. 32* (*interposita distinctione vultuose hoc dicitur, hoc est cum gestu*).² On the other hand, it must be conceded that a very large number of the passages, if taken quite simply and naturally, seem to imply unimpeded facial expression: cf., e. g., the comment on *nihil quidem* (*Eun. II. 2. 42*), dicens 'nihil' mutavit vultum Parmeno in laetitiam; on *Eun. V. 8. 7*, *hoc vultu mutato et conturbato dicitur*; on *Hec. IV. 4. 103*, *melius pronuntiaveris si renitente et improbante hoc vultu dicere acceperis Philippum, quasi non oporteat interesse socerum*. Whether these scholia are of sufficiently early origin to furnish evidence for the theater of the Republican period is, of course, a moot question. At one ex-

est is non cogi in scaena ponere personam, quod ceteris histrionibus pati necesse est. So Mueller's *Festus*, p. 217 a. In l. 1 Mueller would insert *actam* after *primum*, and in l. 2 *acta sit quam* after *annos*. Better than Mueller's *acta sit quam* seems to be the simple change of *coeperunt* to *coeperint* which Hoffer (l. c., p. 18) suggests. The passage is thus interpreted by Munk, *De Fabulis Atellanis*, p. 70: "Festi sententia quam sane paulo negligentius expressit sive potius excerpsit haec est. Naeviana quaedam fabula personata dicta est, quia ab Atellanis est acta; Atellani vero Naevii tempore personati dicti sunt, quia tum soli personis utebantur: nunc vero etiam i. e. eo tempore quo Verrius Flaccus vixit sive quem alium exscripsit Festus, proprie personati vocantur, licet ceteri quoque histriones personati prodeant, quia ius est iis non cogi personam ponere quod ceteris histrionibus pati necesse est".

¹ See also Keil, *Rh. Mus.* VI. 616.

² Wessner prints *hoc est cum gestu* in italics. In his *Praefatio*, p. xlvii, he says: "Inclinatis autem litteris reddi ea imprimis volui, quibus integrum scholium in duas vel plures partes disiectum esse videbatur: hic illic etiam parva additamenta (cf. *And. prol. 6*²; *16*³; *24*²; *25*³; *I. I. 1*⁶; *2*¹; al.) eodem typorum genere exprimenda curavi".

treme stands Sittl who holds that the commentator is not writing for actors at all but for the students of rhetoric and the professional declaimers of his own day,¹ at the other extreme that whole school of Donatus critics from Schopen down who believe that the Donatus scholia on scenic action do really go back to an early source.²

Of the available literary evidence it only remains to examine the extant comedies themselves in the light of two questions: (1) Are there any situations in the comedies of Plautus and Terence which demand the use of masks? (2) Are there any situations in those comedies which indicate that Plautus and Terence intended them to be acted without masks?

To the first question we may answer unqualifiedly "No". That women's parts were from the first taken by masked men used to be held³ on the authority of the Donatus passage (ad And. IV. 3. 1) above discussed. Similarly, before the dissertation of Hoffer (see p. 1, n. 4) it seems to have been commonly believed that masks were used for those rôles on the confusion of which the point of a play turned, e. g., for the two brothers in the *Menaechmi* and for Jupiter and Amphitruo, Mercury and Sosia in the *Amphitruo*. That such pairs of actors may have worn masks is, of course, possible: that it actually was the case

¹"Was von ihm selbst (i. e. Donatus) herrührt, hat für die Bühnenalterthümer keinen Wert, weil zu seiner Zeit längst keine Terenzische Komödien mehr aufgeführt wurden. Daraus ist nun nicht der weitere Schluss zu ziehen, die Gestenscholia müssten alt sein: denn der Terenzcommentar zielt augenscheinlich auf den rhetorischen Unterricht ab. Nun werden wir bald zeigen, dass auch bei der privaten Deklamation die Mimik nicht fehlte. Donat schreibt also weder für Schauspieler noch nach Komikern, sondern als öffentlicher Professor der Rhetorik, weshalb er auch über die Miene Vorschriften giebt, welche doch für die maskentragenden Schauspieler keinen Wert hatten". So Sittl, *Die Gebärden der Griechen u. Römer*, 203.

²The scenic character of a large part of the Donatus scholia is defended by Dr. J. W. Basore in a Johns Hopkins University dissertation entitled *The Scholia on Hypokrisis in the Commentary of Donatus* (Baltimore, 1908), pp. 4-10.

³See, e. g., Lorenz, *Most. Einl.* 15, and Wagner, *Hauton* (Berlin, 1892), *Einl.* 16. This view is repudiated by Lorenz in his second edition of the *Mostellaria* (1883), *Einl.* 6, *Krit. Anm.* 196: van Wageningen in his chapter *De Personis sive Larvis* (*Scaenica Romana*, p. 34) says: "De feminis nihil constat, sed verisimile est actores, qui olim partes muliebres agebant, facie fucata, capillis cultioribus (*δγκω*), manibus gypsatis in scaenam prodisse (cf. Varro, *Eumenides* fr. XLIII: Cic. ad Fam. 7. 6. 1).

is improbable, if all the other actors in the piece played without masks: for, granted a somewhat close resemblance of form and feature in the two actors playing such rôles, masks were certainly not a necessity to the ancients, who evidently knew the use of a large number of cosmetics (cf. Lorenz's note on *Most.* 264).¹ Witness also the modern stage-conventions in a play like the *Comedy of Errors*, of which the *Menaechmi* is the prototype. There are numerous other cases in Roman Comedy in which the disguise is an important factor in the plot, but often no very close resemblance between the counterfeiter and the counterfeited is necessary, for neither is actually known to the person to be deceived. Thus, (a) in the *Asinaria*, Leonida Servus pretends to the strange Mercator to be Saurea Atriensis, but neither Leonida nor Saurea is personally known to the Mercator; (b) in the *Captivi*, both master and slave are strangers to their captors so that neither captive's face would reveal his real identity; (c) in the *Curculio*, the parasite pretends to be Summanus, the freedman of Therapontigonus Miles, but he is a stranger, and needs nothing to conceal his face. More difficult, if indeed we admit any difficulty at all in effecting disguises without masks, are cases like the following: (1) in the *Casina*, a man, an *armiger*, disguised as a woman, *Casina*, is to be given in marriage to the *vilicus*: (2) in the *Persa*, Sagaristio Servus is disguised as a *peregrinus* and brings in the Virgo disguised as a Persa. In these cases, however, the disguise was, of course, helped out by the more voluminous robes worn by women and Orientals.

The word *persona* occurs in the *Persa* (783) and in *Eunuchus* Prol. 26, 32, 35; but in the Terentian passages it evidently means 'rôle', 'character', and in the Plautus passage² merely

¹ That the audience was not very exacting in some details of stage-convention may be inferred from situations like that in the *Menaechmi*, where, in order to make the confusion of the two brothers possible, we must assume (1) that the travelling Menaechmus did not wear *vestis peregrina* at all (though he had *pedisequi* and baggage), or (2) that he wore *vestis peregrina* and nobody cared, not even Plautus, or (3) that those who noticed the difference in costume between the two brothers regarded it merely as one of Menaechmus's jokes (see 317-318, 405, 825).

² *Merc.* 17 is very corrupt; even as emended in the *Triumvirate* edition (= *Merc.* 4) it is of no use for our purpose. Neither Lindsay's actual text nor his suggested readings show *persona* at all.

disguise.¹ *Larva* does not occur in Terence, according to Westerhov's Index; in Plautus² it seems to be employed only in expressions of contempt and reproach.

Less positive must be the answer to the second question—"Are there any situations in the comedies which indicate that Plautus and Terence intended them to be acted without masks?" Although there are several passages which tempt the reader to answer in the affirmative, the only one which points strongly to such an answer is Phormio 209-212:

AN. Obsecro,
quid si adsimulo, satin est? GE. Garris. AN. Voltum contem-
plamini: em,
satine sic est? GE. Non. AN. Quid si sic? GE. Propemodum.
AN. Quid sic? GE. Sat est.
em istuc serva.

Here the natural inference is that Antipho changed his expression gradually, which he could not have done *personatus*.³ That

¹ Cf. Walde, p. 463: "*Persona*, 'die Rolle, der Charakter einer Person; Larve, Maske des Schauspielers; Person': sowohl gegen die Auffassung als 'die von der Stimme durchschallte Maske' (*per* u. *sonare*; Corrsen, Ausspr. I², 482 f., II², 64, 294, wie schon Gellius) als gegen die Annahme von verstümmelter Entlehnung aus Gr. *πρόσωπον* (Keller Volkset. 126) spricht, dass der Ausdruck *persōnāta fābula* älter ist als der Gebrauch der Masken, also nicht von der Bedeutung 'Maske' auszugehen ist. Vielmehr von **persōnāre*, -*zōnāre*, 'verkleiden' (aus Gr. *ζώνη* u. s. w.; *zōnātim* bei Lucil., *sōna* = *ζώνη* bei Plaut., *sōnārius* bei Nov.): *persōnātī* 'verkleidete Leute', *persōnāta fābula* 'Schauspiel in Verkleidung', daraus rückgebildet *persōna* 'Verkleidung' (Stowasser Wiener Stud. XII, 156). Nicht überzeugend Wiedemann BB. XXVIII, 18, Wz.* *perk-* 'umschliessen', s. *compesco*".

² It is found in Am. 777, Aul. 642, Cap. 598, Cas. 592, Merc. 981, 983: *larvatus* occurs in Men. 890 and M. G. 217 (Triumv. Edit.).

³ C. A. Boettiger (Opuscula [1837], pp. 231 sqq.) seems to have believed that Antipho may have worn a mask which allowed a slight motion of lips and jaws, by which motion he could have effected a sufficient change of expression. No later writer on the subject appears to have found such a supposition probable. I know of only one passage in an ancient author which might possibly lend color to Boettiger's theory: that is in the Onomasticon of Pollux (IV. 133) and is a description of a tragic mask: 'Ο δὲ λευκὸς ἀνὴρ, πᾶς μὲν ἐστὶ πολὺς, βόστρυχοι δὲ περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν. καὶ τὸ γένειον πεπηγὸς, καὶ προσπετὴς ὀφρῦς καὶ παράλευκον τὸ χρῶμα, ὁ δὲ ὄγκος, βραχύς. To infer from this that the chin of a mask was sometimes movable seems to me *exceedingly* questionable. On the contrary, there are evidences that the expression could not generally be changed in this way, for sometimes the two sides of a mask were made with different expressions, one side to be turned to the audience at one time, the

vultus was used by Terence of the face and not merely of the head or in the sense of 'bearing', 'mien', Hoffer thinks he has shown by citing other cases of the word in the comedies of Terence. The instances adduced are And. 119, 839, 857; Haut. 887; Ph. 890; Hec. 369; but in five of these passages (And. 119, 839, 857; Haut. 887; Hec. 369) the word is used of persons not present on the stage, while the sixth (Ph. 890) does not fully justify Hoffer's confidence in its testimony.¹ In Plautus especially there are numerous references to weeping, growing pale, etc., but they seem no more significant than similar cases in the modern theater—indeed, perhaps less significant, for in later times, at least, the Roman theater was vastly larger than ours.

The presence of masks in the illustrated MSS. of Terence is no argument for the early use of *personae* on the Roman stage, especially since more recent investigations tend to indicate a much later date for the archetype of those MSS. than Leo asserted for them a quarter of a century ago.² Moreover, every new examination of the recent photographic reproductions of the miniatures is yielding an increasing body of evidence for the unreliability of the pictures in matters of detail. In connection

other at another time. In Quintilian II. 3. 74, after a reference to tragic masks, we find the following words: In comoediis vero praeter aliam observationem, qua servi, lenones, parasiti, rustici, milites, meretriculae, ancillae, senes austeri ac mites, iuvenes severi ac luxuriosi, matronae, puellae inter se discernuntur, pater ille, cuius praecipuae partes sunt, quia interim concitatus, interim lenis est, altero erecto altero composito est supercilio; *atque id ostendere maxime latus actoribus moris est, quod cum iis, quas agunt, partibus congruat.*

¹ The most striking case which I recall from Plautus of change in facial expression is in the mad scene of the *Menaechmi* (828–875). Here a large part of the expression is in the eyes of Menaechmus II (it was to the effect on ocular expression, be it remembered, that Cicero represented the *senes* as especially objecting in connection with the use of masks: *De Orat.* III. 59. 221). A similar description of madness occurs in *Captivi* 594 ff. Of both these passages it may be said that the points noted are part of the standing diagnosis of *insania* among the Greeks and the Romans . . . At first sight a change of expression from grave to gay seems to be implied in *Ter. Eun.* 304, but the editors generally take *alacris* as = *commotus*.

² Whereas Leo (*Rh. Mus.* 38 [1883], 341 ff.) placed the archetype of C, P, F, and O between about 39 B. C. and 79 A. D., Bethe (*Terenti Codex Ambrosianus* H 75 inf. phototypice editus, 1903, Praef. 51–64) thinks it could not have been earlier than the second century A. D., while Dr. Otto Engelhardt (*Die Illustrationen der Terenzhandschriften*, Jena, 1903, pp. 83–92) would make the date as late as the end of the fifth, or the beginning of the sixth, century A. D.

with masks even more than in the case of stage costume,¹ for example, is their testimony disappointing. In Pollux, *Onomasticon* IV. 143-154, we have a list of forty-four masks used in the New Comedy and numerous other types not described by Pollux are said to be extant in various collections of antiquities. Of course we cannot be sure that the latter types were used on the stage; neither can we be positive that Pollux's account of scenic matters can be applied to the Roman stage in an early period. Still, we have a right to expect some variety and individuality in the masks of the Terentian miniatures, if they really represent those used in stage-productions of the plays. As a matter of fact, in all reliable reproductions of the miniatures at hand there are only two broad classes of masks to be distinguished; the grotesque, big-mouthed type, found on slaves, old men, parasites and comic characters generally, and the naturally formed type, generally found on women and young men.² Of the best illustrated MSS., C and F are very consistent in observing this differentiation, P sometimes uses the large-mouthed mask for women, O always assigns it to old men and slaves and generally to all other characters, the exceptions in the last case being entirely irregular and inconsistent.³ The use of the beard is quite as variable; it almost never accompanies the naturally formed mask, but its use with the grotesque mask varies: in O almost all the men's masks are bearded, in F the beard is seldom used, in C and P the practice wavers, even varying from scene to scene for a given character. It is no less difficult to generalize as to the modes of hair-dressing in the miniatures. In the *Aediculae* the masks are, of course, larger and more carefully drawn than in the miniatures, but, again, their testimony is vitiated by its incompleteness and even more by its inconsistency: e. g., the number of masks for a given play sometimes differs in the different MSS.,⁴ or, when the names of the characters are

¹ Cf. *Costume in Roman Comedy* (see above, p. 58, n. 1), pp. 13-16.

² This subject is presented at greater length by Dr. Engelhardt (*l. c.*, pp. 40-47).

³ Sometimes O shows a young man or a woman in a large-mouthed mask and, in the next scene, in a naturally formed mask.

⁴ Before the *Adelphoe* F shows 8 masks (without *aedacula*), C 13 masks (8 with large mouths, 5 with mouths naturally formed). Not only are these inconsistent with each other but with the play itself, in which there are 7 characters that might be expected to wear the grotesque mask and 7 women and

assigned to the various masks of an *aedicula*, the assignments are not always correctly made.¹

We may summarize briefly, then, as follows:

(1) There are several Roman traditions pointing to the introduction of masks between the time of Terence and that of Cicero; on the other hand, there are no ancient traditions for the use of masks from the beginning of Roman Comedy, nor do the extant comedies themselves demand masked players.

(2) The exact date of the innovation cannot be given, though the *terminus post quem non* is 91 B. C. (the date of the dialogue in the *De Oratore*) and the *terminus ante quem non* should, if the commonly accepted views of Dziatzko (see pp. 61-2) are granted, be reduced to the first year of the floruit of Minucius Prothymus. In view of the large range of time within which the absence of positive evidence prevents us from defining that floruit with any certainty, we can only conjecture with Ribbeck that Minucius Prothymus and Roscius were contemporaries or with van Wageningen that Minucius Prothymus was the Greek who introduced the unpopular innovation, the final establishment of which, in the minds of all Romans, was really due to the younger actor, the Roman Roscius. In either case we are bound to take into account the undoubted influence of the Greek stage in the years following the momentous conquests of 146 and 130 B. C. That the date was probably later than 130² is a natural inference from *De Oratore* 3. 59. 221 (see above, p. 59).

young men . . . Before the *Hecyra* F. shows no masks, C 11 (6 of old men, 5 of women and young men); but the *Hecyra* has 6 women and young men and only 2 old men and 2 *servi* . . . Before the *Phormio* C and P show 13 masks in three rows, F 8 masks (without *aedicula*) in two rows: in C and P there are 6 grotesque masks and 7 naturally formed, but the play requires 9 of the former and 4 of the latter (even if Hegio and Crito are to be regarded as young men, there is still a discrepancy between the number of masks and the requirements of the play).

¹ For example, in the *Andria* P shows a mask for Glycerium, whose voice is heard only from the background, one for Chrysis, who died before the opening of the play, one for Archylis who very possibly does not appear on the stage at all, no mask for Chremes and a grotesque mask for Pamphilus *Adulescens*.

² Ribbeck (*Röm. Trag.* 661) placed the innovation between the years 114 and 104 B. C. and with these termini Mueller agrees (*Hermann's Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten*, III. 2. 288, n. 1 end): Teuffel-Schwabe I⁶, 25, say about 114 B. C. Their argument seems to be that a generation before 91 B. C.

I have said that this innovation on the Roman stage was probably due to Greek influence. Many writers on the ancient theater state that the object in using masks was to increase the carrying power of the actor's voice. This question has been discussed at length by Otto Dingeldein,¹ who seems to have shown the falsity of such a theory. Nowhere in Greek literature, he says, is such a power assigned to masks, and it certainly could not have belonged to the first masks, which were made of leaves, bark or linen: in Latin literature the false theory is supported by a single passage from a good period, Gellius 5. 7: *Lepide mi hercules et scite Gavius Bassus in libris quos de origine vocabulorum composuit, unde appellata 'persona' sit, interpretatur: a personando enim id vocabulum factum esse coniectat. Nam caput, inquit, et os coperimento personae tectum undique unaque tantum vocis emittendae via pervium, quoniam non vaga neque diffusa est, [set] in unum tantummodo exitum collectam coactamque vocem ciet, magis claros canorosque sonitus facit. Quoniam igitur indumentum illud oris clarescere et resonare vocem facit, ob eam causam 'persona' dicta est, o littera propter vocabuli formam productiore.* On the other hand the famous Diomedes passage, going back to Varro, says nothing about the strengthening of the voice but implies that Roscius's squint was responsible for his use of masks.² The traditional view of the origin and continuance of the practice among the Greeks³ is clearly put by

(i. e. 124 B. C.) the *senes* of Crassus's day saw actors playing without masks, but that masks came in shortly after that time, probably within the next ten years. Schanz (Röm. Lit., Müller's Hdb. VIII. I. 1⁸, 197) says "Im Jahre 91 war sie bereits vor nicht gar langer Zeit eingeführt worden". However, since Crassus may be interpreted as implying that he and his contemporaries, unlike the *senes*, had never been accustomed to seeing actors performing *regularly* unmasked (*Scaenica Romana*, 37), those authorities seem more reasonable who put the innovation back a considerable number of years before 91 B. C.

¹ In a paper entitled *Haben die Theatermasken der Alten die Stimme verstärkt?*, *Berliner Studien für Class. Philol. u. Archaeologie*, 11, pp. i-46.

² Cf., however, Dr. Basore's estimate of this view, *A. J. P.* XXIX 225.

³ The uniform use of masks on the Greek stage has until very recently been accepted without question. Even in the last edition of Haigh's *Attic Theatre* (Pickard-Cambridge, 1907, p. 262) no doubt is expressed as to the old tradition. However, scholars are beginning to feel that the evidence for their use in the classical period is not altogether conclusive. See F. L. Hutson's review of Hense's *Die Modificirung der Maske in der griechischen Tragödie*

Dr. Albert Mueller in the following words: " Zum dramatischen Costüm gehörte auch die Maske. Dieselbe stammte von der an den dionysischen Festen, aus welchen das Drama entstanden ist, üblichen Farbung und Vermummung des Gesichtes, da es nun natürlich war dass die Person, welche den Gott darstellte, das eigene Gesicht unkenntlich zu machen suchte. Auch später scheinen bei festlichen Gelegenheiten manche Priester die Maske ihrer Gottheit getragen zu haben. . . . Getragen von religiöser Scheu, hielt sich der Gebrauch der Masken bis in die späteste Zeit,¹ und man übersah das in der Maske liegende Unnatürliche um so eher, als die Schauspieler einerseits bei den mehr typischen als individuellen Gestalten der Tragödie im Stande waren, das ganze Stück hindurch eine Grundstimmung festzuhalten, anderseits unter der Maske sich leichter den oft allen Anstand überschreitenden Scherzen der Komödie hinzugeben vermochten".¹

CATHARINE SAUNDERS.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

(Class. Philol. 3. 458-459) and A. W. Verrall's review of Kelley Rees's *The Rule of the Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama* (Class. Rev. 23. 191 ff.).

¹ Mueller, l. c., pp. 270-272.

IV.—κ AND π FORMS IN THE EARLY IONIC POETS.

The pronominal stem πo- (πη-) frequently appears as κo- in the MSS of the early Ionic poets (e. g., *όκοίην* Archil. 70³); in most of the prose writings there is a preponderating majority of κ forms, while Homer and the inscriptions of the Ionic cities and their colonies (always including the Islands) present nothing but πo and πη.

SUGGESTED EXPLANATIONS.

Various attempts have been made to account for the origin of these mysterious forms in κ; but no thoroughly satisfactory explanation has yet been offered.

RIDGEWAY. Professor Ridgeway (*Early Age of Greece I*) holds the κ to be a survival from primitive Greek; "literary Ionic kept the original forms in κ such as *κοίος, κῶς* = *ποίος, πῶς*. Now, as the forms with κ are not found on any inscriptions, it is plain that the Ionians had abandoned them before the sixth century B. C. . . . The archaic form always survives in literature when it has ceased to be used vernacularly", p. 676. The use by the Samians of *Κυανόψια* for the *Πυανέψια* festival of Athens and the *Πανόψια* of other Greek states is not a sufficient proof that in Ionic the κ forms represent the speech of the earliest emigrants; the κ of *Κυανόψια* may owe its form to popular etymology or be due to some other purely local reason.

Why, with this single exception, should the alternation of κ and π be confined to one solitary instance, the pronominal stem πo? It is a widespread phenomenon in the other interrelated Indo-Germanic dialects commonly adduced as parallels; cf. Irish *cach*, Welsh *pawb* Lat. *quisque*, Oscan *pispis*: Ir. *cethir*, W. *pedwar*, Lat. *quattuor*, Osc. *petora*: Ir. *coic*, W. *pump*, Lat. *quinque*, Umbrian *puntes* ('pentads'): and even in loan-words Ir. *casc*, W. *pasg* (*Pascha*, Easter). No theory can be regarded as fully adequate unless it accounts for the restricted use of κ and π in the dialects of Greece.

Prof. Ridgeway dismisses the question of the absence of κ forms from Homer as one "which those who allege an Ionic origin for

the poems or parts of the poems will have to answer". For "if the poems were composed on the mainland of Greece in either Thessaly or Argolis under the domination of the labializing Achæans, then the non-appearance of the κ forms is explained on the same principle as that by which we have already explained the appearance of *πίτταρες*, *πίσυρες* and *ἵππος*. . . . The argument from the κ forms only holds good against Ionia, and not against the Aeolid, as the possible place of origin for the Homeric poems", p. 677.

But the difficulty by no means disappears; even if it is admitted that the π forms originated in the European home of the epic, how comes it that the Homeric poems offer no single instance of the Ionic κ, while other Ionisms, e. g., η for ā, are ubiquitous? Is it at all likely that amid so many innovating tendencies a rigid archaism should have prevailed in the case of forms so easily admitting of change as *ὁπότε* and *πῶς*?

The three examples quoted by Ridgeway afford no parallel; *πίτταρες* is not found in Homer; *πίσυρες* could not, for metrical reasons, be changed to *τίσσαρες*; and *ἵππος*, not *ἱκκος* with its un-Ionic κκ is the form always used even by those representatives of pure Ionic who write *ὁκότε* and *κῶς*.

MÖLLER. Some (e. g. Möller) maintain that Ind.-Germ. κ^ν lost its labialization (ν) in the enclitic forms of these words and became κ, that is, when the following vowel did not bear the accent; resulting in a double series *κως*, *κου*, *ὄκως*, *ὄκου*, *πῶς*, *ποῦ*, κτλ.; the distinction was subsequently lost owing to the workings of analogy; the κ forms invaded the territory of the π forms, and *vice versa*.

BRUGMANN. Brugmann (Griech. Gr¹, p. 33) suggested that in Greek Ind.-Germ. κ^νā- became κā; accordingly there once existed side by side pronouns and adjectives in *πο-* masc. (from κ^νο-) and *κα-* fem. (from κ^να-), with adverbs *κά* *κᾶ*. Then followed a levelling process which varied in different dialects; in Ionic the π forms were all expelled in favour of κ; in the other dialects the masc. π drove out the fem. κ, except in *καί* which retained its original κ; cf. Lith. *kai*, Old Bulg. *ѿѿ*. There are two serious objections to this solution:

(1) There is not sufficient evidence for the existence of κ forms in the other dialects. Brugmann's single parallel rests upon the very dubious derivation of *καί* from an Ind.-Germ. labialized root. Two solitary instances of κ for π in Lesbian, *ὄκαι* (if the reading be correct) and *ὄκοσσον* (Cyme), instead of the usual *ὄππα* *ὄππως* κτλ.

may indeed indicate that the area invaded by κ forms embraced the Aeolians as well as their Ionian neighbours; dialectic innovations often extend into two districts of entirely different linguistic origin, e. g., psilosis, which affected Lesbos as well as Asiatic Ionia.

(2) If the change from $\kappa^{\nu}a$ to κa occurred in primitive Greek, how is it that there is not a single κ form in the earliest Ionic (and Aeolic) that has come down to us, while in a later period of the dialect (Callinus, etc.) they appear in comparatively numerous quantities? There is no evidence that the fem. $\kappa a-$ was ever more frequent than its own creation the masc. $\kappa o-$; curiously enough the only representatives of the former in early Ionic poetry have both π , viz. $\pi\eta$ Archil. 60, $\delta\pi\eta$ Sim. Am. 1².

In addition to the above theory that had been propounded in the first edition Brugmann offers another explanation in Gr. Gr.² Ionic, he maintains, may once have possessed a form $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma = \tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$, in Thessalian $\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. Under the influence of this word $\pi o-$ became $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}o-$; afterwards $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ became $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ and $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}o-$ $\kappa o-$, for which latter change he compares $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\kappa\kappa\omicron\nu$ for $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu$ (cf. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\kappa\acute{\upsilon}-\varsigma$) and $\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (cf. $\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\upsilon}-\varsigma$). We see the process reversed in Cyprian $\delta\pi\epsilon\ \sigma\iota\varsigma = \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \tau\iota\varsigma$ where π is due to the influence of $\pi o-$ [cf. $\delta\pi\epsilon$ 'auf welche Weise', zum pronom. Stamm $\varrho\acute{\upsilon}\iota$, $\tau\iota-\varsigma$ Thumb, Gr. Dial. 1909].

This theory is hardly convincing, as it postulates the influence of a form which cannot be proved to have existed. In his third edition Brugmann rejects his previous hypotheses in favour of Solmsen's view that the κ forms started from combinations like $\omicron\delta\kappa\omega\varsigma$ $\omicron\delta\kappa\iota\varsigma$; (cf. $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\iota\varsigma$ for $\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\iota\varsigma$), the original labial being lost owing to the presence of υ as in $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, $\beta\omicron\nu\kappa\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ($\alpha\iota\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$). This explanation which has been adopted by Hirt, Buck (Gr. Dial. 1910), and many other scholars, is certainly the best that has yet been offered, and would at least account for the co-existence of π and κ forms in early Ionic.

EVIDENCE: GRAMMARIANS; INSCRIPTIONS; MS TRADITION.

GRAMMARIANS. There is frequent mention of this Ionic peculiarity (κ for π) in the writings of the ancient grammarians; it is, for instance, included among the five special characteristics of Ionic in the *Περὶ Ἰάδου* commonly attributed to Johannes Grammaticus (sixth century A. D.), a work itself derived from Alexandrian sources.

INSCRIPTIONS. The evidence of inscriptions, in spite of its limited range, is, on the whole, clear and unmistakable. The following is a complete list of all Ionic inscriptions bearing upon the question. The references are to Collitz and Bechtel's collection, *Gr. Dial. Inschr.*

IONIC OF ASIA.

δοῖον Iasus (a colony of Miletus) 5517, not long after 450 B. C. ; δπου Halicarnassus 5727, early fourth century B. C. ; δπόσοι Teos, 5633, 370–50 B. C. according to Wackernagel, early Hellenistic according to Judeich ; πον Zeleia (a colony of Miletus) 5532, soon after the battle at the Granicus 334 B. C. The following are of no value, as the inscriptions in which they occur exhibit numerous marks of Attic influence : πον Teos 5634 ; δπως (twice) Samos 5698.

IONIC OF THE ISLANDS.

δπόραι, δπότεροι Eretria 5307, between 410 and 390 B. C. ; δπου Ceos 5398, late fifth century ; ποτε (? in an elegiac couplet?) Amorgos 5353, in the archaic Ionic alphabet ; δπου, δπως Thasos 5483, early fourth century B. C. ; πον Amphipolis (i. e. Chalcis) 5282, 357 B. C.

Π AND Κ FORMS IN THE TEXT OF POETS, THEMSELVES NATIVES OF IONIA (INCLUDING THE ISLANDS), WHO WROTE IN THE IONIC DIALECT BEFORE 500 B. C.

MS TRADITION. Callinus of Ephesus : κότε' 1¹ ; κως 1¹² ; κοτε 2² ; δπότε (an Aeolism) 1⁸. All MSS except B read ποτ' 1⁸, but τότε' is certainly the correct reading. Metres, elegiac.

Archilochus of Paros and Thasos : πω 25² (iamb.); πῆ 60 (tetr.); δκοίην 70², δκοίσις 70³ (tetr.); πον 73 (tetr.); ποῖον 94¹ (epode); πῶς 122 (εἶδος ἀδελον); κω or κως in a recently discovered fragment of an epode, Strassburg Papyrus (second century A. D.) edited by Diehl *Supplem. Lyricum*, Archil. 3⁶. Thumb, *Gr. Dial.*, p. 352, quotes κω or κως from "the Parian fragment of Archilochus"; there is some mistake about this, as no such instance occurs in the published texts of the Parian inscription (no. 4 in Diehl); Thumb was probably thinking of the Strassburg papyrus.

Simonides of Amorgos : δπη 1² ; δπως 1⁵ (iamb.); δκως 7⁸², δκου 7⁸¹, κοτ' 7⁸⁰, δκου 7¹⁰⁸ (iamb.).

Mimnermus of Colophon: *κοτ'* 11¹; *ποτ'* 12²; *οὔποτε* 14⁵.
Metres, elegiac.

Xenophanes of Colophon: *οὔποτε* 1⁵; *ὀπόσον* 1¹⁷; *ποτε* 6².
Metres, elegiac.

Hipponax of Ephesus: in 19¹ most editors read *κω* *χλαῖναν* for the MS *χωλεύαν, χλαῖναν, τὴν χλαῖναν; χώλαιναν* old editions. Some (e. g. Brink, Bergk) read *κοτ' ἐγγύς* 42²; MSS *κατ' ἐγγύς*, and *κάτεγγυς* which Hoffmann accepts, quoting a note by Meineke "*κάτεγγυς* dictum ut *κατιθύς, κατευθύ* κτλ."; this is adopted by the revisers of Bergk's text who reject his reading *κοτ' ἐγγύς*. The above instances of *κ* forms have therefore no MS authority. *δκου* 51² (chol.) also quoted as *δπου* in schol. Lycophr. 579; *ὅπως* 85³ (hexam.); *πῶς* 87 (hexam.).

Ananius, a contemporary and perhaps fellow-citizen of Hipponax: *που* 1¹ (chol.) in a quotation made by Aristophanes (Frogs 659); an Attic comedy cannot be regarded as a trustworthy witness for *π* in an Ionic poet; cf. Renner (in Curtius: Studien I, p. 156), "cum Ar. tres illos versus Dionysum dicentem faciat, non mirum videtur in Atticam dialectum abiisse".

Anacreon of Teos: in 1⁴ some read *ῆ* *κου* on (for our present purpose) insufficient MS evidence; others (e. g., Bergk, Farnell) *ῖκου* or *ῖκευ*. Some form with *κ* (*κώκοτ'*, or *κω τότ'*) is certain in 33; *δκως* 63² according to Athenaeus 427 A, who quotes the same fragment with *δπως* 475 C (inferior MSS *δκως*); for *ποτ'* 85 we have no real authority, as it occurs in a much-quoted proverb (Ar. Plutus 1002) attributed to Anacreon; but *ποτ'* is always the form given in all our sources, e. g., Zenobius V 80. Metres, Anacreontic except 85 (iamb.).

There are two *π* forms in elegies, probably spurious, assigned to Aesop of Samos and Demodocus of Leros: *πῶς* Aes. 1¹; *ποτ'* Dem. 4¹.

RESULTS: allowing the *κ* forms the benefit of the doubt in Hipp. 51² and excluding *ὀππότε* Callin. 1⁸, as an Aeolism, we get from the MS tradition of the early Ionic poets 13 well-attested forms with *κ*, 15 well-attested forms with *π*.

There is not a single instance of *κ* for *π* in the works of the early poets who wrote in the Ionic dialect, but were not themselves natives of Ionia; the *π* forms are numerous, e. g., *οὔπω* Tyrt. 11², *πω* Theogn. 43, *μήποτε* Theogn. 69. In spite of this fact, Hartung (Gr. Elegiker, Vol. I) has printed Callinus 1 among the elegies of Tyrtaeus without even troubling to change

the κ forms in 1¹, 1¹² (κότ', κως). The absence of κ forms affords an argument (if indeed argument were needed) against those who would assign Theognis 1231-1389 to Mimnermus or some other Asiatic poet.

IONIC PROSE.

PROSE. The practice of the early prose-writers in Ionia seems to have varied according to individual preferences. Instances of π are extremely rare in the MSS of Herodotus; but it is doubtful whether they should be expelled in favour of the very common κ in cases where the evidence is unusually strong, as in I 188, where all MSS read *δοποι* or *δοπη*. Hippocrates appears to have preferred π except perhaps in the combination *δοκ*-; but even the ancients were not agreed as to his choice in this respect; as Gomperz has pointed out, the inferior MSS of Hipp. offer a far greater number of κ forms and suggest a desire on the part of the copyists to impart a stronger 'Ionic' colouring to the text. It should be remembered that Hdt. always wrote *δοδοαπός*; cf. Xenophanes *πηλίκος*.

LATER POETRY.

We also meet κ forms in the later poets; Phoenix of Colophon (date unknown) has *δοκου* Athen. 360 A; *δοκόσον* ib. 530 E; *χωκόσ'* (twice) 530 E (all chol.); *μήποτε* occurs in an elegy attributed to Scythinus of Teos (perhaps a contemporary of Plato) rejected as spurious by Bergk, *Poet. Lyr. Graec.*⁴, p. 508.

In Herodas "the forms in *κο*- are considerably more frequent than those in *πο*-". Nairn, *Introd.*, p. lxiv. With regard to the latter he rightly remarks, "it is not certain that these forms with π- for κ- are really Attic. They may be old Ionic", p. lx. Crusius also retains both forms in his text of Herodas, e. g., *ποτ'* 6^π, *κοῖος* 6^κ.

THE NEW CALLIMACHUS. The same variety is presented by Callimachus. The new fragments of the Aetia (eleg.) and Iambi published and edited by Dr. A. S. Hunt in Oxyrh. Pap. VII, no. 1011 (late fourth century A. D.), have added very considerably to the previously available materials (viz. two instances of κ fr. 85, 93). In the Index to these poems we find 11 κ and 2 π forms, with another example of κ suggested as an alternative conjecture in the notes; for the purpose of our present inquiry these figures require a certain amount of modification. There can, however, be no doubt of the following: *κοτε* 4, 211 (not in the

pap., but supplied from fr. 93); ποτε 54; ὁπότε 26; χῶπότε 236; που 112; ὅκου 93 as proved by fr. 85, pap. δίκου (sic); κως 161; κῶς 278, 403; lines 1-89 come from the Aetia, the rest from the Iambi.

The other forms in the editor's text must be set aside as uncertain for the following reasons:

L. 18. "Wilamowitz objects to κοτε as inconsistent with the context . . . and would therefore substitute καί . . . In the papyrus κοτ or κατ is fairly plain". A. S. H.

L. 54. "Κοτε is substituted for ποτε in this verse on the analogy of ll. 4 and 18. In the Hymns the forms in π are preferred, but the Ionic spelling occurs in some of the Epigrams". A. S. H.

But the evidence for κοτε in 18 is very doubtful, and in 236 (Iambi) Dr. Hunt himself accepts the π of the papyrus. L. 112, που pap., κου text; no reason given. L. 234, ο. [...] pap., text ὁκ[οίη]ν. L. 254, καιγ[.]ρ pap., κοῦ γάρ (text) is a conjecture made by Wilamowitz "which distinctly improves it unless, as Murray suggests, we read in 254 ἦν". A. S. H. L. 291, εικο. pap., "perhaps εἴ κοτ', possibly εἶχον". A. S. H.

RESULTS FOR CALLIMACHUS. Our revised list gives us 6 κ and 4 π forms against the editor's 12 κ and 2 π.

In the Persians of Timotheus we find ποτ' 118; and κῶς 162, used by a foreigner Ἰάονα γλῶσσαν ἐξιχνεύων.

LATER PROSE.

Of the later prose-writers and Ionic "revivalists" Lucian preferred κ; "his only exception seems to be ποτέ Dea Syr. 29", according to Professor Weir Smyth who elsewhere in the same book gives Lucian πως V. A. 4 (Ionic Dialect, p. 291). There is an overwhelming majority of π forms in the Ionic of Arrian; both κ and π occur indiscriminately in the MSS of the other late Ionic writers.

THE BEARING OF THE EVIDENCE ON THE PRACTICE OF MODERN EDITORS.

There is nothing in the above evidence to justify the practical unanimity with which modern editors and grammarians have expelled the π forms from the early elegiac and iambic poets of Ionia; the list includes Fick, Crusius, Biese, Buchholz, Peppmüller, Renner, Hoffmann, and others, but not Bergk, the π

forms of whose Anthologia Lyrica have been changed to κ by the editors who revised the text after his death. A typical instance is afforded by the Gr. Dial., Vol. III (Ionic) of Hoffmann, who has added to his chapters on grammar a revised text of Archilochus and other early poets.

HOFFMANN. For his treatment of Callinus see *infra*, p. 83. In Mimn. and Sim. Am. he has changed every case of π into κ without giving any reason for the correction. In Hipponax π is twice changed to κ, in fr. 87 because "the text is corrupt" (*mangelhaft überliefert*), the meaning of which statement we can see on turning to his critical note, "πῶς überliefert: der Dialekt fordert κῶς". On p. 596, he defends δπῶς 85³ because it occurs in a "Spottgedicht in Hexametern und im pathetisch-epischen Stile"; but in his text he prints it with κ, although he expresses some hesitation in a critical note. Xenophanes, as "a later elegist" is allowed to retain the traditional forms in π. Why? He was still far too early to be affected by Attic influence.

Except where Archilochus is concerned, Hoffmann apparently regards the tradition of a single κ form in the works of an early Ionic poet as a sufficient reason for the rejection of all the π forms in his writings. Hoffmann has certainly not effected this change on statistical grounds, making the minority conform with the majority; for, of the three examples in Mimn., two have been emended to bring them into line with the single form in κ; and, again, in the case of Hipponax considerable emendation is required to make the κ forms balance those in π. It is hard to see why an exception should be made of Archilochus whose κ forms are rejected by H. as hyper-Ionisms; this rejection cannot be due to the insular origin of the poet, as H. more than once tells us that in this respect no distinction can be drawn between the Ionic of Asia and that of the Islands, and indeed he regards -πo- as the only genuine form in the text of Hippocrates and elsewhere (p. 595) tells us that we do not know which Ionic cities use κo for πo. Nor can he have been led to this choice by the occurrence of π forms alone in the inscriptions of Thasos, where Archilochus spent a considerable part of his life; for he definitely reckons him as a poet of Paros, while he twice expresses a doubt whether Simonides wrote in the dialect of Samos or in that of Amorgos; besides, had he wished to conform with inscriptional evidence, he should

have also 'restored' π to Anacreon of Teos, as the inscriptions of that town present nothing but π forms.

ASIATIC AND ISLAND IONIC. It has been suggested by Wilamowitz (Hom. Untersuch.) that the forms in κ were peculiar to Eastern Ionic, while the π forms were alone in use among the inhabitants of the Islands. The scanty materials at our disposal do not warrant this conclusion. There is, as we have seen, no instance of κ in the inscriptions of Asia or the Islands; our MS evidence does not discriminate between the two districts (Asiatic poets 6 κ , 7 π ; Island poets 7 κ , 7 π). Even if we reject Sim. Am. (as a possible writer of Eastern Ionic) the proportion of π forms (5 π , 3 κ) in the writings of Archilochus is not enough to bear the weight of Wilamowitz's theory. We have still left three κ forms in Archil.; Hauvette (Archiloque) regards the passage in which Arch. 70³ is quoted ('Plato' Eryxias) as a genuine fragment of Prodicus, who got the quotation from Heraclitus; the latter philosopher had changed the π of Archil. to conform with the κ of his own native dialect; but, as Hauvette himself allows, we still have $\delta\kappa\omicron\iota\eta\nu$ in the same passage as given by another source (Stobaeus).

WEIR SMYTH. Professor Weir Smyth believes that "the Ionic dialect possesses both π and κ as in $\pi\omega\varsigma$, $\kappa\omega\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$, $\kappa\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$, and in all connected forms" (Ion. Dial., § 341); but he will not admit that the same poet could use both: "though it cannot be gainsaid that no poet of Ionic birth could use either κ or π in the same word, we are unable to demonstrate in all cases which was the chosen form. In any event I regard it as problematic whether any of the instances of the π forms in the MSS of the iambographs and Ionic elegists (though here the evidence is less certain) are retentions of the original" (ib.). Seeing that "the Ionic dialect possesses both π and κ ", and that early Ionic poetry is full of epic reminiscences, we should naturally expect to find a poet using forms in π , even though his own city-dialect preferred κ . If he was at liberty to introduce a genitive singular in $-\omicron\iota\omicron$ as well as in $-\omicron\nu$, why could he not adopt a similar variety in the form of a pronominal stem? Sophocles in his lyrics could write $\mu\eta\chi\alpha\nu\alpha\iota\varsigma$ (Antig. 349) and $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\nu\alpha\iota\varsigma$ (Ajax 181), if, with Jebb and other editors, we accept the best MS tradition. If an Athenian could write $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$, $\eta\nu$, and $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$, why could not an Ionian write $\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ and $\kappa\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$, just as an English poet will use *hath* and *has*?

THE EPIC AND EARLY IONIC POETRY. The influence of epic diction is itself a sufficient warrant for the retention of well-attested π forms in Ionic poetry. It is, of course, well-known that later scribes smuggled Attic forms into the MSS of non-Attic writers; it is equally true that the texts of Ionic literature have been inundated with a mass of hyper-Ionisms (e. g. *μηδεμίν* Theogn. (A.) 152, *αὐτίων* masc. in Hdt.), falsely deduced from the salient features of the Ionic dialect, of which the most obvious are undoubtedly the use of η for Attic α after ε, ι, ρ, and the substitution of κ for π in pronominal stems. It is not unlikely then that π was sometimes changed to κ in the MSS of Ionic authors. It is worth noting that we rarely have κ and π in the same fragment of an early poet, e. g., π twice in Sim. Am. 1, κ four times in Sim. Am. 7, though we owe both poems to the same anthology (Stobaeus). This indicates that the text of the poets may have been tampered with by early scribes for the sake of securing uniformity.

Subdialectal differences may indeed have existed in the various Ionic cities, and the κ (or π) forms may have been confined to the speech of certain localities; but, as far as we can judge, the early poets wrote in an Ionic *κοινή* tinged (in the case of the elegists at any rate) with a strong admixture of epic words and forms.

HOFFMANN. Hoffmann, Fick, and others, it is true, deny the influence of Homer on the phonetics and morphology of Archilochus and Callinus. But forms like *Ἐνναλίῳ ἀνακτος* (with the un-Ionic digamma) or, if we accept the variant preferred by H., *Ἐν. θεοῖο* (Arch. 1¹), and *ὁππότε κεν δῆ* (Callin. 1⁸) are a sufficient proof that the writers did not confine themselves to pure Ionic. It is, to put it mildly, sheer begging of the question to regard *ἴσσεται, πελάγεσσι, τόσσον* and the like as "genuine Ionic forms no longer spoken in the language of daily life" (Hoffmann). We have no evidence that they ever existed in uncontaminated literary Ionic, nor can we explain away *ὁππότε κεν δῆ* by calling it "a quotation from Homer" (Hoffmann); we could with equal justice extend the name to other π forms in early Ionic poetry; cf. *οὐ ποτε πάμπαν*, Od. 4, 693; 11, 528, which recurs in the same metrical position in Mimn. 14⁵, where H. has altered *ποτε* to *κοτε*. In this particular case (Callin. 1⁸) the metre did not allow the correction of *ὁππότε* to *ὀκότε*, and Bach's conjecture *ὀκκότε* is a 'ghost-form', for -κκ- like -ππ- is a combination unknown to

Ionic; *κεν* could have been accounted for as a loan from the vocabulary of Homer, a proceeding admitted by Hoffmann. So he had to content himself with calling the phrase a 'quotation', though he cannot refrain from adding a doubt as to the authenticity of the text. The presumption is that poets who borrow words and phrases from Homer will also borrow forms from the same source. And H. himself (p. 184) asserts that the imitation of the non-Ionic element in Homer begins with so early a writer as Mimnermus. What we deny is not the greater frequency of such forms in later Ionic poetry, but their entire absence, as claimed by Hoffmann, from the works of the oldest Ionian poets.

INSCRIPTIONS. The testimony of the inscriptions is, as we have seen, somewhat meagre, and their dialect is occasionally open to grave suspicion; e. g., *ὄντας* 5727, *ξένων* 5517, *ἐπίων* 5633, *ταύταις* 5398 betray a tendency to use Attic forms which appears in a colony of Miletus (5517) as early as the fifth century B. C. The cumulative evidence is still quite enough to prove beyond all doubt the existence of *π* forms in Ionic territory (cf. 5307 Eretria, and the early inscription from Amorgos); but the inscriptions are by no means sufficiently numerous or free from the suspicion of Atticism to disprove the presence of an alternative *κ* element in other Ionic localities as well as in the very towns to which we are indebted for the inscriptions themselves.

SUMMARY. To sum up; although our material is limited, general considerations, such as the influence of Homer, and the testimony of Ionic inscriptions, as well as statistics based upon a multifarious MS tradition, all point in the same direction, viz., to the indiscriminate use of *κ* and *π* by the pre-Herodotean poets of Ionia. We cannot draw any distinction in this respect between the Ionic of Asia and that of the Islands; in neither quarter do the inscriptions give a single instance of a *κ* form, and a careful sifting of the literary (i. e. MS) evidence maintains herein a remarkably even balance between the two districts. The editor of these poets must therefore in every case make his choice of *κ* or *π* according to the MS testimony at his disposal.

T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES, BANGOR.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

ARISTOTLE ON THE ART OF POETRY.

A revised text with critical introduction, translation and commentary by INGRAM BYWATER. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1909. 8°. Pp. XLVII+387. \$4.00.

This is the first comprehensive critical edition of the Poetics of Aristotle, with translation and commentary, to appear in recent years. We may, therefore, fittingly begin a review of this important work with a brief survey of the history of the Poetics.

We know almost nothing of the status of the Poetics in the Greek and Alexandrian periods. There are many latent references to the work, however, in the rhetoricians and the Homeric Scholia which indicate that its principles had deeply influenced the literary criticism of the time. Antiquity does not seem to have regarded it as one of the great works of Aristotle. In the eighth century the Poetics were translated into Syriac, and in the eleventh from Syriac into Arabic. Upon this Arabic version the commentary of Averrhoes (ob. 1198) was based, which was translated into Hebrew and from Hebrew into Latin in 1515. Apart from the fact that the oldest extant Greek MS (A^c) was written about 1000 A. D., there is but slight indication of interest in the work in the Middle Ages. The Poetics were not among the Aristotelian books which found translators in the 13th century.

The modern history of the Poetics begins in the second half of the 15th century. The Greek text was a favorite work among the Italian humanists. In 1498, the first Latin translation, that of G. Valla, was given to the world. Strange to say, it was not included in the great Aldine Aristotle of 1495-8.

The *editio princeps* of the Greek text appeared finally in 1508 in Vol. I of the Aldine *Rhetores Graeci*. The editor, Demetrius Ducas, to the misfortune of sound scholarship, used one of the poorer manuscripts and indulged in frequent emendations on his own account. It is in consequence full of corruptions, but notwithstanding held for centuries its supremacy—as a sort of *textus receptus*. In 1555, Gu. Morel attempted to supersede it by a recension based on Parisinus 2040, a fairly faithful copy of A^c, but without much success; and the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries witnessed many editions and commentaries based chiefly on the Aldine.

Ritter in 1839 was the first to denounce the *editio princeps* as an entirely untrustworthy text. His contention was carried

further by Spengel (1865) and by Vahlen (1867), who upheld the unique authority of the Parisian manuscript 1741, known as A^c, as the one record of the Greek textual tradition and the ultimate source of all our Renaissance texts. Johannes Vahlen must always be regarded as the father of scientific criticism and study of the Poetics. In his *Beiträge zu Aristoteles' Poetik* (1865) and his critical editions of 1867 and 1874, he not only established a satisfactory text but also provided a copious and learned commentary on every important problem needing interpretation, from which all later editors have freely drawn.

The late Professor Butcher, in his essays on the Poetics in the first edition of *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius* and in his *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, which with text, critical notes, translation and a series of essays has passed through three editions, has produced an independent text and made a thorough exposition of Aristotle's theory of poetry and art in the light of the author's general system of philosophy. Because of the fundamental nature of the principles of epos and tragedy presented by Aristotle, the Poetics have been the source of numerous treatises in the past two centuries. Butcher gives 66 titles of editions and translations and other writings relating to the work, and several more have appeared in recent years. The English predecessors of Butcher and Bywater most deserving of mention are Goulston (1696), Twining (1789), and Tyrwhitt (1794).

In this work of Professor Bywater we have the presentation of introduction, text, translation and commentary in one volume of XLVII + 387 pages. As Bywater and Butcher represent entirely different schools of thought both as to text and interpretation, it will be well as we proceed to indicate points of contrast between these two able Aristotelians.

The first section of Bywater's Introduction is a consideration of the form and structure of the existing Poetics. The author begins by pointing out that many of the difficulties of the Poetics are the result of preconceived notions in regard to the general character of the Aristotelian writings, namely, that all of them must conform to rigid standards of logic and be perfect in matters of form. The Poetics, on the contrary, judged by our modern standards of literary correctness, are marked by great inequalities and are frequently open to criticism. Among anomalies of language or thought, Bywater notes instances of (1) anticipatory use of technical terms, (2) variations of terminology, (3) inconsistency in the use of terms, (4) inconsistency of thought and (5) lapse of memory. There are also difficulties in the general plan and structure. The scheme as a whole is admirably simple and logical, consisting of five parts: (1) a preliminary discourse on tragedy, epos and comedy (cc. 1-5); (2) a definition of tragedy and rules for its construction (cc. 6-22); (3) rules for the construction of an epic poem (cc. 23-24); (4) classification of current

criticisms of an epic or tragedy and of replies to them (c. 25); and (5) a comparison of epic poetry and tragedy, showing the artistic superiority of the latter (c. 26). But great difficulties are met with which call in doubt the genuineness of certain chapters and suggest the rearrangement of certain sections. Transposition, however, only makes matters worse, and the best solution is to conclude that Aristotle, like Homer, sometimes nods and never gave a finished form to the work.

The second section is entitled *The Lost Second Book*, and gives internal and external evidence to show that our treatise is only the surviving portion of a larger work, being Book I of the original treatise. There are indications that Book II must have covered (1) the discussion of Comedy promised in *Poet.* 6. 2 and (2) the Catharsis theory referred to in *Pol.* 8. 7.

The third section treats *The History of the Poetics*, which we have briefly sketched.

The major part of the Introduction, however, is devoted to the existing data for the constitution of the text and the apographa, a technical name for all later MSS, being the fourth and fifth sections respectively. The sources of the textual tradition of the *Poetics* are two, namely, the Parisian MS 1741, known as A^c and (2) the traces of another Greek text recoverable from the Arabic version and the surviving fragment of the lost Syriac version. Bywater follows Vahlen in ascribing unique authority to A^c—a fine specimen of Byzantine calligraphy of the tenth or eleventh century, which he regards as the archetype of all later MSS—and in questioning the value of the Arabic version. In both these respects his position is diametrically opposed to that of Butcher.

Bywater considers the Arabic version as valuable merely because we are often able to look beyond it so as to recover the readings of a Greek MS at least three centuries anterior to A^c. He does not regard the Syriac version as an accurate piece of work and thinks that even if the Greek original (Σ) were before us, its readings would have to be considered one by one on its merits. Butcher, on the contrary, while recognizing the superiority of A^c over all other extant MSS, cannot share the confidence with which Vahlen and Bywater speak of it as the sole source from which the rest are derived. He also places a far higher estimate upon the Arabic version, showing how in some 50 instances where the Arabic points to a Greek original diverging from the text of A^c, it confirms the readings found in other MSS. He therefore, concludes that the better readings in the 'apographa' confirmed by the Arabic version point to the survival in the 15th century of another textual authority, a now lost Greek MS, independent of A^c and free from its errors. Thus Butcher, following chiefly Christ, represents one school of textual critics leaning rather toward the Arabic version, while Bywater, following Vahlen, regards the light from this Oriental quarter

as often a mere *ignis fatuus* and insists upon the absolute supremacy of A^c.

In compliance with the custom of editors of Greek texts of this description, Bywater, like Butcher, faces the text of the Poetics with a translation, or rather a paraphrase, which is a very effective interpretation of the text. As he says in the preface, he has not scrupled to recast many of Aristotle's sentences and to insert here and there words or short clauses in order to make the sense and sequence of ideas clearer. We have in consequence an English version of the Poetics of the best verbal material and texture written in a style so attractive that the reader is often tempted to neglect the Greek and read through at one sitting Bywater's felicitous prose. A good illustration of his method is seen in his rendering of the famous definition of tragedy: "A tragedy, then, is the imitation of an action that is serious, and also, as having magnitude, complete in itself; in language with pleasurable accessories, each kind brought in separately in the parts of the work; in a dramatic, not in a narrative form; with incidents arousing pity and fear, wherewith to accomplish its catharsis of such emotions. Here by 'language with pleasurable accessories' I mean that with rhythm and harmony or song superadded; and by 'the kinds separately' I mean that some portions are worked out with verse only, and others in turn with song."¹

As regards the commentary, Bywater's notes are generally short and to the point. He frequently cites pertinent passages from other works of Aristotle, from Plato and other Greek writers, but seldom refers by name to modern editors. The influence of Vahlen's *Beiträge* shows itself throughout, but he manifestly has little patience with Butcher's endeavor to expound Aristotle's theory of art.

In fact, in the preface, he states that he has not ventured on a discussion of the problem of Aristotle's general theory of Poetry and Art, as it would require a volume by itself to deal with a matter of such extreme complexity and would lead into regions of thought remote from the avowed subject of the Poetics. He thinks that too much has been read into Aristotle's incidental utterances and that Aristotle would himself be surprised, should he come to life again, to see what theories have been credited to him. He adds that the very idea of a Theory of Art is modern, and there is very little to show that Aristotle had ever thought out his ideas of artistic theory sufficiently to reduce them to system even in his own mind. From his silence, therefore,

¹ ἔστιν οὖν τραγωδία μίμησις πράξεως σπουδαίας καὶ τελείας μέγεθος ἐχούσης, ἡδυσμένῳ λόγῳ χωρὶς ἐκάστῳ τῶν εἰδῶν ἐν τοῖς μορίοις, δρώντων καὶ οὐ δι' ἀπαγγελίας, δι' ἐλέου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν. λέγω δὲ ἡδυσμένον μὲν λόγον τὸν ἔχοντα ῥυθμὸν καὶ ἁρμονίαν καὶ μέλος, τὸ δὲ χωρὶς τοῖς εἶδεσι τὸ διὰ μέτρων ἓνια μόνον περαίνεισθαι καὶ πάλιν ἕτερα διὰ μέλους.—1449 b 24-31

we may infer that Butcher's elaborate essays found little favor with Bywater.

The only note of sufficient length to approach the essay form is Bywater's discussion of the interpretation of *Κάθαρσις* in the definition of tragedy, as to whether the term is to be understood as a physiological metaphor, in the sense of 'purging' or 'clearing away', or as a metaphor from the religious rite of lustration in the sense of 'purification'. He concludes that the ancient evidence, in Aristotle and elsewhere, is very strongly in favor of the first interpretation.

This, the pathological interpretation, is generally associated with the names of Weil (1848) and Bernays (1857) though in its essential points it is much older, as seen in Tyrwhitt's (1794) note on the present passage. It signifies that the tragic excitement "serves as a sort of medicine producing a *catharsis* to lighten and relieve the soul (*κουφίζεσθαι*) of the accumulated emotion within it; and as the relief is wanted, there is always a harmless pleasure attending the process of relief". Bywater's admirable treatment of this subject makes us wish he had in like manner expanded his discussion of many disputed problems of the Poetics. Butcher also adopted the pathological theory of Catharsis and contributed to it an artistic element by showing that the function of tragedy is "not merely to provide an outlet for pity and fear, but to provide for them a distinctively aesthetic satisfaction, to purify and clarify them by passing them through the medium of art". This I regard as a much broader and more satisfactory interpretation of *Catharsis*.

To take up some points of detail, I cannot agree with Bywater in his interpretation of certain passages of C. XXV, discussing *προβλήματα* and *λύσεις*, or objections made to poetry and the answers to them. He begins by stating Aristotle's postulates which may supply the defense with arguments to meet the attacks of critics, but when he comes to the general observation at the close of this section beginning, *περὶ δὲ τοῦ καλῶς ἢ μὴ καλῶς ἢ εἰρηταίῳ ἢ πέπρακται* (1461 a 4-9) he translates, "As for the question whether something said or done in a poem is *morally* right or not", etc., and in his note to the passage states that "the objection Aristotle is now considering is the moral objection, the criticism that something said or done by a personage in a poem is not morally right". This rendering of *καλῶς* is inconsistent with his own translation of *καλῶς* in the opening sentence of the Poetics, *πῶς δεῖ συνίστασθαι τοὺς μύθους εἰ μέλλει καλῶς εἶναι ἢ ποιήσεις* "of the structure of plot required for a good poem". *καλῶς* is uniformly used in the Poetics to express what is *poetically* right, and we have an aesthetic, not a moral, reference in this passage. Cf. c. VIII, 1451 a 22-24, c. XIII, 1453 a 12, etc., which prove that Aristotle uses *καλῶς* to express the artistic correctness of a poem or any of its special features. Illustrations drawn from the Homeric Scholia demonstrate this interpretation. What Aristotle

here asserts is that speech or action must be interpreted in the light of all the circumstances—the persons, the occasion, the end it is designed to serve; and if from a study of these the speech or action shows itself to be in accordance with necessity or probability, then its artistic excellence—and this is ever supreme with Aristotle—is assured. Butcher's translation in his third edition is more exact. "Again in examining whether what has been said or done by some one is poetically right or not, we must not look merely to the particular act or saying and ask whether it is poetically good or bad", etc.

The determination of the twelve λύσεις or Solutions has long troubled editors (*αἱ δὲ λύσεις ἐκ τῶν ἀριθμῶν σκεπτέαι, εἰσὶν δὲ δώδεκα*, 1461 b 24–25) and Bywater does not seem to have been much influenced by the more recent investigations of this subject. Thus he separates in an arbitrary manner the alternatives under the first postulate that, as the poet is an imitator, the poetic picture may represent either *οἷα ἦν ἢ ἔστιν* or *οἷα φασι καὶ δοκεῖ* or *οἷα εἶναι δεῖ* and gets five different λύσεις namely, (1) *οἷα ἦν*, (2) *οἷα ἔστιν*, (3) *οἷα φασιν (εἶναι)*, (4) *οἷα δοκεῖ (εἶναι)* and (5) *οἷα εἶναι δεῖ*. This analysis is palpably too minute, there being only three λύσεις under this postulate, namely, (I) Poetic Truth (*οἷα εἶναι δεῖ*), (II) Current Legends (*οἷα φασιν καὶ δοκεῖ*) and (III) Custom (*οἷα ἦν ἢ ἔστιν*).

Then under the second postulate that poetic language is not the same as ordinary speech, he finds only six modes of interpretation of the written letter of poetry, namely, (6) γλῶττη (7) κατὰ μεταφοράν (8) κατὰ προσωδίαν (9) διαιρέσει (10) ἀμφιβολία and (11) κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς λέξεως, whereas Aristotle distinctly adds and illustrates with an example a seventh λύσις under *ἐκ τῆς λέξεως* in the passage *δεῖ δὲ καὶ ὅταν ὁνομά τι ὑπεναντίωμά τι δοκῇ σημαίνειν, ἐπισκοπεῖν ποσαχῶς ἂν σημαῖνοι τοῦτο ἐν τῷ εἰρημένῳ, οἷον τῷ "τῇ ῥ' ἔσχετο χάλκεον ἔγχος" τὸ ταύτῃ κωλυθῆναι ποσαχῶς ἐνδέχεται* (1461 a, 31–34). "But whenever also a word seems to imply some contradiction, it is necessary to reflect how many ways there may be of understanding it in the passage in question; e. g., in Homer's *τῇ ῥ' ἔσχετο χάλκεον ἔγχος* one should consider the possible senses of 'was stopped'", etc. This corresponds in its sense and application to (X) ὁμωνυμία treated and illustrated in Soph. El. IV 166 a 6 ff. as a λύσις ἐκ τῆς λέξεως, and as it is frequently appealed to in the Homeric Scholia to explain the so-called inconsistencies of Homer, it is surely one of the most important of the λύσεις. It is true that Bywater holds that ἀμφιβολία mentioned above is the same thing as what Aristotle calls elsewhere ὁμωνυμία (see note on 1461 a 25), but at the same time he cites Soph. el. 4, 165 b where ἀμφιβολία is distinguished from ὁμωνυμία. ἀμφιβολία is concerned with the variety of senses in two or more words from their grammatical connection; while ὁμωνυμία or ποσαχῶς ἂν σημάνειε considers which of a variety of the natural senses of a word is the proper one in a disputed passage (cf. M. Carroll, Aristotle's Poetics in

the Light of the Homeric Scholia, pp. 51-55, J. H. U. thesis, Baltimore, 1895).

Finally, under the third postulate that poetry as a distinct art has a correctness of its own, Bywater finds only one λύσις, whereas there are two, illustrated by examples, namely, (XI) the End of Poetry (τὸ τέλος, 1460 b 23), and (XII) the Accidental (πρὸς συμβεβηκός, 1460 b 29-32) in explanation of technical inaccuracies as regards other arts and sciences. Thus the grouping is (3 + 7 + 2), not (5 + 6 + 1) as Bywater puts it.

The volume concludes with an Appendix giving a synopsis of versions and paraphrases of the clause about the *Catharsis*, an Index of Greek Words and an Index to the Commentary.

MITCHELL CARROLL.

TWO STUDIES IN NOUN SUFFIXES.

Greek Diminutives in *-ιος*. A Study in Semantics. By WALTER PETERSEN, PH. D., Professor of Greek in Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas. Weimar, 1910.

The Suffixes *-mant* and *-vant* in Sanskrit and Avestan. By HAROLD H. BENDER, PH. D., Instructor in Modern Languages in Princeton University. Johns Hopkins Dissertation: Baltimore, 1910.

Two different points of view in the scholarly investigation of noun suffixes are represented by these works. Dr. Petersen's title plainly states that his primary interest lies in the semantic development of his suffixes, and he has little to say about phonetics. Dr. Bender, on the other hand, devotes only 25 out of the 99 pages of the descriptive part of his text to semantics; the rest deals with the phonetic correlation of his suffixes and their euphonic combination with word bases. This is, however, no reflection on the scholarship of either author; the reason lies rather in the facts of the case. The semantic uses of the suffixes *mant* and *vant* are not particularly varied or interesting, while the phonetic questions connected with them deserve, as Bender shows, very close study. On the other hand, whatever phonetic interest there may be in the Greek *-ιος* suffixes is entirely overshadowed by their very complicated and interesting semantics.

Bender's work of 116 large pages is divided into two parts, the larger section dealing with the Sanskrit language, the smaller with the Avestan. He has found 2200 words in Vedic and Classical Sanskrit ending in *mant* and *vant*; of these 1748 have *vant*

and 452 *mant*. The proportion of *mant* to *vant* words is slightly larger in the RV., but from AV. on it is about as in Classical Sanskrit, viz. 1 : 4. The complicated question of the choice between the suffixes, i. e., in what cases *mant* was used and in what cases *vant*, has remained in a state of hopeless confusion, in spite of the efforts of Pāṇini and Benfey to straighten it out. It has remained for Bender successfully to accomplish the task. By a comparison of the state of things in the Avesta, the Veda, and the later Sanskrit he shows that it depends on the vowel of the syllable before the suffix, in the following way :

1) In Indo-Iranian, as in Avestan, *mant* was used after an *u*-vowel, or a consonant immediately preceded by an *u*-vowel ; other stems took *vant*.

2) In the early parts of the Veda *vant* is still used after *ā*-stems (or those in which *ā* preceded a final consonant), but other vowels (that is the *i*-vowels and *r*) have begun to go over to *mant*, which predominates with all except *i*. The *u*-vowels still keep to *mant*.

3) In later Sanskrit *mant* has gained the field almost to the exclusion of *vant*, in the case of other vowels than *ā*,—except that, curiously, *i* still continues to take *vant* in a majority of cases. (The total number of cases with *i* is, however, comparatively small.)

The number of exceptions is not inconsiderable, but B. is in general successful in explaining them as due to analogy, to parallel word-forms in different vowels, to word or line cadence or the like.

Chapter II deals with the *saṁdhi* of *mant* and *vant*, a very troublesome subject. Not only are the rules of external (instead of internal) combination used in many cases (p. 43 ff.), but there are also many 'lengthenings' and 'shortenings', and even 'omissions' and 'insertions' of final stem vowels. Personally I should substitute 'appear to be' for 'are' in all these cases, without exception ; I confess to more *skepsis* than the author seems to show. And when it comes to 'dropping' and 'inserting' final *consonants*, this *skepsis* increases. Surely such cases (they are of course very rare) must be purely analogical, except in so far as the 'dropping' of an *n* is concerned ; this is of course, as Bender remarks, really no dropping, but the use of a weaker form of the stem (*açma-vant*, cf. *açman-vant*). B. indeed also calls attention to considerations of analogy, metrical cadence, etc., as being at least occasionally the cause of such phenomena. Especially interesting is his note that before the fem. form (*vatī*) of the suffix a long vowel is particularly common ; he thinks this may be due to metrical cadence. May it not also have something to do with the adjectival and nominal fem. endings *ā* and *ī* ?

Chapter III deals with the meanings of the suffixes arranged in order of their frequency of occurrence. A number of examples are given under each head ; there would have been some

advantage in giving exhaustive lists here, but it seemed better to the author to give his complete lists in phonetic divisions instead. The simplest and most primitive meaning of the suffixes ('possessing, having') prevails, Bender finds, in 60% of the cases. Next in order of frequency are the words having the force of present participles (7—10%). The arrangement of the groups in descending arithmetical progression necessarily separates related groups; the author however undertakes to supply this deficiency by a section in which he treats briefly of these relationships, with an illustrative diagram. I suppose no one would ever be quite satisfied with another's arrangement of such delicate things as these shades of semantic variation; and I know from personal experience the difficulty of such arrangements. Bender makes 19 semantic divisions, besides a twentieth which includes nine scattering and miscellaneous subheads. Some of these divisions seem based on rather trifling differences of meaning, and it might have been well to use a much smaller number of groups, and to arrange them so as to bring out more clearly their interrelationships.

Part II, dealing with the Avesta, is naturally much shorter, since there are only 190 words (168 in *vant*, 22 in *mant*) which are found. It follows closely in detail the treatment of the Sanskrit suffixes. Interesting is the table (pp. 86—7) of identical words appearing in both Sanskrit and Avestan. Except for the difference in phonetic treatment mentioned above, the Av. brings out little or nothing additional. Its use of the suffixes reveals much narrower semantic limits.

Bender's work is a most valuable contribution to Aryan philology, and is in fact the first serious study that has been made of any Sanskrit suffix on a basis of modern philological scholarship. Its phonetic treatment (which is in this case of overwhelming importance) is especially admirable; I think no doubt will remain in the minds of scholars that he has proved his case as to the relation between the suffixes *mant* and *vant*.

It would take much more space than I have at my disposal to touch adequately upon even the more important of the many interesting problems dealt with in the compressed richness of Dr. Petersen's book of 300 pages. My remarks on it will necessarily be largely eclectic. The subject is a large one, much larger in fact than the rather modest title would indicate; as a matter of fact Petersen takes up in a pretty systematic way the whole of the *-ant* suffix in Classical Greek, and by no means limits himself to semantic considerations, altho they are his main interest. He is commendably generous in his citations of examples, with full passages, under each of his headings, and in the case of the more important semantic divisions his lists claim and appear to be quite exhaustive for Classical Greek. It is perhaps to be regretted that he did not find some way of recording

systematically *every* -*iov* word known to occur, with proper classification; and altho that would have swelled the proportions of the already bulky work, it would have given a touch of completeness and finality to it, and would have also helped other investigators who might wish to look into the suffix for themselves.

P. deals briefly, but, it seems, satisfactorily, with (Ch. II) the euphonic combination of -*io*- with various stem-finals, and (Ch. III) the accent of -*iov* nouns, of which he finds that Chandler's and Allinson's rules will not hold. With Ch. V (p. 15) begins the semantic discussion. In this chapter the author deals with abstract nouns with verbal force; in the next, with abstracts 'expressing an attribute or state', from adjectives. It would seem to me unlikely that the mere fact of these words being used often, or even exclusively, as abstracts justifies their complete separation from the similar nouns which are only found as concretes. Thus, *συνέδριον*, <*συνέδρα*, because it means 'council' as well as 'council chamber', is put here; but *καταγώγιον*, <*καταγωγή*, he puts among place names containing -*iov* as a 'suffix of appurtenance', twenty pages farther on. But whether the concrete or the abstract meaning of *συνέδριον* was more primary, surely the suffix must have been as much a suffix of appurtenance here as with *καταγώγιον*. The two manifestly belong together. And even when a word is found only as an abstract, I see no ground for such a separation. These abstracts might better be made a subhead of the regular suffix of appurtenance. The abstract meaning was probably secondary as a class, tho not in every single word.

In Ch. VIII P. treats -*iov* as a 'suffix of appurtenance', meaning 'belonging to' or 'connected with'. He regards this as the starting point for all the following groups, viz. -*iov* meaning 'coming from' (Ch. IX), meaning 'made of' or 'consisting of' (Ch. X), as a suffix of possession (Ch. XI), meaning 'belonging to the category of, having the nature of' (Ch. XII), meaning 'that which is like, but not equivalent to the primitive' (Ch. XIII), as a deteriorative suffix (XIV), as a diminutive suffix (XV), and as a hypocoristic suffix (XVI). It is now and then a little hard to follow his reasoning. Perhaps it would be better not to try to derive all these meanings from one original, in the case of -*iov*. The reviewer was confronted with an almost identical collection of meanings in the Vedic suffix -*ka* (see his forthcoming article in JAOS Vol. 31), but here the way to a right solution was made plain by the language itself; the oldest Vedic knows *ka* practically only in the sense 'having the nature of', 'similar to', and in the diminutive-pejorative uses, which (as P. rightly shows also for -*iov*) are secondary to that. Accordingly, the suffix *ka*, at least, must have developed the meanings of possession and appurtenance, which it has later, thru the meanings 'having the characteristics of', 'characterized by', 'related to'. This line of development is easily conceivable for the suffix -*iov* also.

But these matters are both highly subjective and of little real importance in comparison with the admirably clear, thoro and illuminating way in which each of the individual semantic divisions is treated by P. The very numerous words under the heading 'appertaining to', etc., are quite properly divided into groups of words with related meanings: place names, plant names, instrument nouns, names of vessels and utensils, etc. The meaning 'coming from', including the patronymics, P. rightly derives from the appurtenance idea, but names for the young of animals [ὀρνίθιον, etc.] would better be regarded as diminutives. The meaning 'made of', 'consisting of', he finds rare in the adjectival form (-ιος), it being supplanted by -ειος and -υιος; but the neut. -ιον is common. As a suffix of possession the suffix is rare. I should derive this from the suffix of likeness and characteristic; ἀστέριος 'characterized by stars'; κόμιος 'that of which dust is a prominent characteristic, which suggests dust', and so 'having dust'. So with the next category, meaning 'having the nature of, characterized by'; it is, I think, more apt to precede than to follow the idea 'belonging to', and the idea 'being like' is older than the idea 'belonging to the category of'. The words in this class are of two kinds, according as they are of generalizing (τὰ ἀράχνια—the members of the genus 'spider') or of specializing meaning; the 'specializing' variety came to be used almost without distinction from the primitive. The author recognizes the difficulty of distinguishing these words (e. g. ζώνιον: ζώνη) from diminutives; and I should suspect such force in all names of ornaments, small garments, etc., which P. has classed here.—Close to this comes the next division, where -ιον has the meaning 'like (but not equal to)', a fairly numerous class, which serves as a starting point for the deteriorative, diminutive and hypocoristic uses.

Of these, P. is willing to derive the hypocoristic from the diminutive (of size), but vigorously protests against making the deteriorative secondary to the diminutive, or vice-versa. Both, he thinks, are more apt to come independently from the suffix of likeness. I agree with him in this, and have carried out the same thought in my thesis on the Sanskrit *ka*-words; but it did not seem necessary to me to emphasize the fact, and it seems to me that Petersen exaggerates its importance. For after all, all these ideas are very closely related; approximate likeness with failure of perfect identity suggests inferiority, smallness, delicacy, etc., all more or less at once; a suffix which had the first meaning could hardly avoid taking on the others, and even the same word, formed with such a suffix, may and often does appear with different 'diminutive' values in different contexts. P. himself must recognize that the diminutive and pejorative values belong closely together, since he groups them as 'diminutives' (to be sure, always quoting the word) in discussing the time of their

origin (Ch. XVIII). In detail, his account of these groups is instructive, and his collection of examples exhaustive and valuable.

Ch. XVIII, on the time of origin of the 'diminutive' uses, is excellent. He shows, successfully as I think, that the claim of diminutive use for the IE. suffix *-io-*, raised by Brugmann and others, is quite unprovable. The diminutive use of *-ιον* in Greek he believes to be later than the epic, and even than the early elegiac and melic poets, whose fragments do not show it. To be sure, Petersen seems to me to overemphasize the absence of diminutive *-ιον* in Homer; Homer avoids diminutives altogether, tho some such suffixes must certainly have existed in his time. The most elevated style eschews even 'faded' diminutives, P. to the contrary notwithstanding. P. quotes the German *Mädchen*, and thinks no German poet 'would care, or even be able to avoid' the use of it, 'no matter how elevated his style'. But the fact is, German poets in their elevated moments *do* avoid it. In the text of Wagner's *Walküre* it is used only once (and there consciously, with studied effect), while the poetic 'Maid' occurs 22 times—if my hasty count is correct. Moreover I did not notice a single other occurrence of *-chen* or *-lein* in the play. The use of diminutives by Lucretius (p. 199) does not argue against this; for Lucretius was a philosopher, and the diminutives are a sign of his philosopher's pose,—his contempt for the so-called insignificance of earthly affairs. The same theory is especially noticeable in the writings of the Stoic philosophers, e. g., in the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius, as Professor Gildersleeve has reminded me; nor is the use limited to them. On the general stylistic value of diminutives, see Peppler, *Comic Terminations in Aristophanes*, Baltimore, 1902.—Nevertheless, I think Petersen shows pretty clearly that there is at least no positive reason for thinking that the diminutive use of *-ιον* antedates post-Homeric Greek.

The last twelve chapters of the work deal with compound suffixes containing *-ιον*. Their origin, by 'clipping' from words in which *-ιον* was added to another stem, is fully and satisfactorily treated. The following suffixes are treated: *-διον* or *-ιδιον*, whose meanings he finds almost as varied as the simple *-ιον*; *-αδιον*, mostly late and of heterogeneous origin, also widely varying in meaning (only one-third of the words are diminutive); *-υδριον*, most frequently deteriorative in classical times; *-ακιον* (only a few scattering examples in classical Greek, not exclusively diminutive); *-ισκιον*, cf. *-ισκος*, generally diminutive; *-αλ(λ)ιον* and *-ελ(λ)ιον*, the former being found in two or three diminutives, the latter probably not really existing; *-υλλιον*, prevailingly deteriorative; *-ῶνιον* only in *στηθύνιον*, endearing diminutive; *-(δ)αριον*, most commonly diminutive; **-υριον*, wrongly set up by Schwabe as an independent suffix; *-ασιον* < IE. *-t(i)ion*, rarely diminutive; *-αφιον*, *-ηφιον*, *-ιφιον* and *-υφιον* (the first being the commonest), prevailingly diminutive.

Again I must give expression to my deep sense of the impossibility of doing justice to Dr. Petersen's very scholarly and admirable work in such a limited review. Perhaps no one who does not know by experience the laboriousness of this kind of suffix study could fully appreciate the enormous amount of industry, thought and care which the author has put into his subject, and the results of which show on every page. Tho one may be allowed to differ with him now and then on more or less abstract questions of derivation of meanings, this does not in any way detract from the value of the rich collections of material or the careful sifting of them.

(NOTE.—On p. 110 Petersen quotes Sanskrit *maryaká* as meaning 'manikin'. But the word means '*Männchen*' in the sense of 'male animal, bull', a wholly different idea. The Pet. Lex. gives this meaning, which some later interpreters have unwisely abandoned. See JAOS 31, part 2, p. 149.)

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK,
Vol. XV (dedicated to Professor Bücheler on the completion
of his fiftieth year as Doctor of Philosophy). First Part.

Pp. 1-9. K. Brugmann, *Senex Iuvenis*. The IG. form of the former is *sen-os, with which we may directly connect Lat. senior, seneo and senescō. The change from an original o-stem and the use of senex as a substantive were due to the influence of iuvenis. The nom. senex, which is allied to senecio, senecta and senectus, may well be due to the awkwardness of a nom. *so, which the analogy of the original nom. *iuvo would give, but the stem senec- yielded to seni- through the influence of iuveni-. Conversely seni- influenced iuveni- in preventing the regular change to iuvini-. The study closes with a tribute to the Senex iuvenis of Bonn, to whom the volume is dedicated.

10-22. E. Wölfflin, *Die Sprache des Claudius Quadrigarius*. An examination of the views of Gellius on this subject in Noct. Att. XVII. 2. The language of Quad. has little that is more archaic than would be expected in the time of Sulla. There is little or no conscious effort for archaism, such as appears in Sallust. He has many characteristics of the poetic style, drawn from the epic and tragic poets, and occasionally from comedy and satire, especially a freer use of the collective singular and the poetic plural. He extended the sphere of the abl. abs.

23-29. H. Peter, *Zur Textesgeschichte der Scriptores historiae Augustae*. An examination of the attempt of E. Patzig (Byz. Zeitschr. XIII. 44-50) to get additional material, independent of cod. P, from the second edition of the Scriptores (Venice, 1489), with an unfavorable verdict.

30-33. Fr. Vollmer, *Lexikalisches aus Horaz*. In Carm. 4. 4. 36 would read indecorant; in 3. 6. 10, inauspicatus, a form of compound of which H. was very fond; in 3. 29. 24 aequore = "smooth river-bed"; in 3. 24. 4 terrenum omne = "the whole mainland"; in 3. 14. 19 would read vagacem, from vagax.

34-54. F. Skutsch, *Zur lateinischen Syntax*. An attempt to apply the methods of phonology and morphology to syntax, especially the influence of analogy. 1. The use of substantives as adjectives. This occurs not only in exercitus victor, etc., but vetus (*ῥῆτος*) and uber (*οὐδθαπ*) were originally substantives. On the analogy of felicia arma, arma victricia appears in poetry (first

in Vergil), then *ultricia*, etc. 2. Use of cases. The use of the nom. for the voc. is sometimes due to metrical reasons, but not always. It was extended by analogy to the o-declension from the others, in which the form of the nom. and the voc. were the same, first in such combinations as *meus pullus passer*. The use of the partitive gen. with *affatim*, *largiter*, etc. arose from analogy with its use with *parum*, *multum* and other forms which were identical with the neuter sing. of adjectives, with which the part. gen. would regularly be used. *Foras* and *foris* point to an original paradigm **forae*, -arum. *Foras* was an acc. of limit of motion, and *foris*, originally meaning "at the door" came to mean "outside the door". *Fores*, -ium is due to the analogy of *aedes*, -ium. *Hic clarior est quam ille* (instead of *illo*) is due to the analogy of *hic tam clarus est quam ille*. 3. *Refert*. This verb and interest affected each other by analogy. *Meā*, *tuā*, etc. belong to *refert*; *multum*, *plus*, *plurimum* and the double question to interest. After examining the different theories as to *rē*-, which has been regarded as nom., dat., abl., and acc. plur., S. decides for the nominative, since *fert* is not used impersonally. The *ā* in *meā*, etc., is due to the fact that *rē*- was taken for an abl.

55-62. O. Hey, *Aus dem kaiserlichen Kanzleistil*. Such an expression as *edicendum putavi* means *edixi quia necessarium putavi*, and is apologetic. The use occurs in Cic. and Caes. and is very common in the later juristic Latin. Here two forms appear: the first person (*pluralis maiestatis*), where the emperor speaks of himself, and the third (more rarely the second) person, mostly in conditions, with reference to punishable offences. These uses can be explained only on the assumption that frequent use had disguised the original meaning, so that such phrases had become simple expressions of will. Hegesippus has a liking for this construction and uses it in many cases where Josephus used the simple verb. This does not affect the question of the identity of Ambrosius with the translator of Josephus' *Bell. Jud.*, since Ambrosius and other contemporary writers use the construction, and it may be assumed that A. used it more frequently in his younger days.

62. E. Wölfflin, *Fatidicus*. Would read this word for **facitidia* in Donatus on Verg. *Aen.* 6. 180 ff. (p. 533. 19, Georg.).

63-73. M. Ihm, *Die Apicius-Exzerpte im codex Salmasianus*. Text, with explanatory and critical notes. These excerpts are distinct from the ten books of the *ars coquinaria*.

74-87. Th. Birt, *Einiges, was uns die Handschriften lehren*. Evidence from the Palat. codd. of Plautus for *hoccine*, which by false analogy gave *hicce*, *hucce*, *huncce*. *Etquis* for *ecquis* should be allowed to stand in the texts. The dat. form *quo* is attested for Cic. Verg. Sen. and in an inscription in *Carm. Epigr.* 420. 1 f.; also in Plautus and Varro.

88. Fr. Marx, *Fefellitus sum*. A defence of this form, read by Bücheler in Petr. 61. 8, and of *pepertus*.

89-105. R. Heinze, *Supplicium*. The word is used of other punishments than those by death. In Plautus the word implies a personal injury, to be atoned for by punishment or by fine, by way of satisfaction to an individual. It meant first the appeal for reconciliation, then the punishment. When the Law determined the punishment, the foreign word *poena* was used. *Supplicium* is applied to a public enemy only when conquered and begging for mercy. *Supplicium sumere* and *supplicio adficere* usually mean punishment by death, but not always; for example in Sall. Cat. 60, where it is expressly stated that death is not meant.

105. L. Havet, *Deformare*. Would read *deformat* (*deforet*) for *deferat* in Lucil. 1191, Marx. The word is derived from *fori* as *deponere* from *pons*.

106-112. E. Hauler, *Lepturgus, chirurgus* u. ä. bei Fronto. In *Quid? si quis postulare... aut Calamis Turena aut Polyc(l)etus Etrusca*, p. 113. 1, Naber, would read for *turena*, *lepturgata* (the palimpsest has 10 letters); cf. *λεπτουργεῖν* of products of the fine arts in Plut. vit. Aem. Paul. 37; or perhaps *lepturga*. For *Etrusca* H. would read *chirurgia*, in the sense of manual work, that of the artisan as opposed to that of the artist.

113-120. W. F. Otto, *Mania und Lares*. In Varro, *Sesculixes* (463 Büch.) *suspendit Laribus marinas mollis pilas, reticula ac strophia*, we should read *manias* for *marinas*, with Meursius. The *maniae* were not dolls, for which the word is *pupae*, but were bogies or hobgoblins. On account of *strophia* the line can not refer to offerings made by a maiden passing into womanhood, but may perhaps refer to offerings before marriage. The *Lares* are connected with death and the underworld.

121-128. M. Pokrowskij, *Zum Thesaurus Glossarum emendatarum* von G. Götz. Notes on a number of passages. Discussion of the confusion of *de-* and *dis-* in the glosses.

128-137. E. Lommatzsch, *Zur lateinischen Orthographie: ei für i auf lateinischen Inschriften der Kaiserzeit*. This is confined to a few definite cases, especially the plur. of the second decl. It is common at the beginning of the period, but soon diminishes and finally disappears except in some stereotyped forms. The archaists under Claudius and in the second century attempted to restore *ai*, but the use of *ei* for *i* does not increase during those periods.

138. E. Lommatzsch, *Zu CARM. EPIGR. n. 2*. In b, line 2 reads *ad veitam*; in 3, *AASTVTIEIS*; in 4 the only possible reading is *sai(pi)sume*; in 5 the punctuation *imperat. oribus* is certain.

139-143. A. Brinkmann, *Simpuvium—simpulum*. Both these words are used of a vase corresponding to the Greek *κύαθος*. The former is the original name, while the latter is a corruption of late times.

144-146. Miscellen. W. M. Lindsay, *Hercules*, 5 Dekl. A discussion of the declension of personal names in -es in Plautus.

F. Skutsch, *Persōna*. Believes it to be a borrowed word from Etruscan *persu*, = Lat. **persō*, -ōnis, whence *persōnare* and *persōna*. This view is in harmony with that of the Etruscan origin of the Roman drama.

A. Becker, *Zur Aussprache des C*. See Hey, *ALL. XIV. 112* (A. J. P. XXXI. 345). In pseud.-Quint. decl. mai. the usage in alliteration shows a varying pronunciation, pointing to a period of transition. This supports the view of Hammer that the declamations were of Gallic origin and belong to the middle of the second century.

147-152. Review of the Literature for 1905. 1906.

153-163. Th. Birt, *Doppelformen im Lateinischen*. Regards the following as doublets: *elementum* and *alimentum*; the former occurs in good writers, with assimilation as in *similis*, *semel*, *fescennini*, *fascinum*; *coitus* and *coetus*; the former is dissyllabic in *Lucr. 2. 1061*: *vafer* and *faber*; *fabre* = *vafre* occurs in *Plaut.*, while *fabrica* and *fabricare* have the meaning of cunning device, devise cunningly: *nevel* and *neve*; the former can not be read in *Hor. Sat. 2. 5. 89*, with some of the best MSS., for metrical reasons: *phydrio* for *phrygio*; this orthography is ancient and has an analogy in Greek: *alter* and *adulter*; *alter* = *adulter* in *Plaut. Miles 288* and *320*, and in *Prop.*; *adalteratum* in *Sen. Epist. 97. 5* (cod. Argent.).

164. L. Brichta, *Zur Enallage adiectivi*. An additional example from *Ov. Am. 3. 7. 21* (see *ALL. XIV. 105 ff.*; A. J. P. XXXI 345).

164. J. Denk, *Fraumentum* = *fragmentum*. A sure example from *Acta Apost. apocrypha* of Lipsius (*Act. Petri cum Simone*, cap. 11, p. 59. 17), of the same epoch as *Dracontius* in whose *Laud. dei 3. 715* Vollmer adopted the form from cod. Brux. saec. XII. In *Sall. Hist. 3. 54* (Nonius) *frumentis* is doubtful.

165-211. H. Christiansen, *Que—que bei den römischen Hexametrikern* (bis etwa 500 n. Chr.). For the most part we find two words connected in this way, generally substantives. No cases of more than two words are found with adjectives and adverbs, and but two with verbs. With substantives the cases are more frequent, but the usage is rare. It was introduced from Homer by Ennius, but contrary to Homer's practice the usual place in Latin is after the caesura.

Special rules were developed in Latin with regard to elision, lengthening, etc., which were in general carefully observed.

212. O. Probst, *Zu Lucrez* 4. 990. Would complete the verse with the words *edere vocem*.

212. C. Weyman, *Malus vel pravus*. This is the correct order in *Regula S. Benedicti*, 4, instead of *pravo vel malo* of *cod. Oxoniensis*; cf. *Sall. Cat.* 5. 1 *malus pravusque*. *Vel* = *et*, as often in *Benedict*.

213-221. J. Wackernagel, *Qua—qua*. *Lympha*. *Eruptum* = *ereptum*. In *Plautus* *qua—qua* is nearly equal to *et—et*. It is avoided by *Terence*, but was retained in colloquial Latin. It is not indefinite, but relative, and originated in *qua—qua potest*. *Lympha* is Gk. *λύμφη*, and not from Italic **dumpā*. *Lucilius'* *limpor* is a contamination of *liquor* and *lympa*. *Eruptum* = *ereptum* should be retained as an archaism in *Apul. de Mag.* 28 (p. 33. 19, Helm).

221-222. A. Döring, *Pontifex. Kalendae. Idus. Etymologien*. The first is from **spontifex* (cf. *spondeo* and *sponte*) since the *pontifex* was called upon to officiate when the ordinary citizen was not *suae spontis* (cf. *Cels.* 1. 1), the last cognate with *αἶθω*, *aedes*. *Kalendae* is not from *calare*, but from *cal* in *occulo*, *clam*, and *celo*, the "dark of the moon".

223-232. E. Bednara, *Aus der Werkstatt der daktylischen Dichter*. A continuation of the articles in *ALL.* XIV. 317 ff. and 532 ff. (*A. J. P.* XXXI 349). A collection of new forms used by the dactylic poets which gave two short syllables, or at least one, from *Catonis Disticha*, *Ovid's Amores* and *Ex Ponto* I, including those taken over from the earlier poets.

233-252. P. Geyer, *Die wirkliche Verfasserin der "Peregrinatio Silviae"*. A notice of Férotin's *Le véritable auteur de la Peregrinatio Silviae, la vierge espagnole Éthéria*, Paris, 1903 and Anglade, *De latinitate libelli qui inscriptus est Peregrinatio ad loca sancta*. Accepts the former's conclusion that the work was composed by *Éthéria* between 378 and 388. The work, however, shows more indications of Gallic than of Spanish Latin.

252. P. Geyer, *Pullus* = *gallus*. Additional examples of this use.

253-260. E. Wölfflin, *Die Interpretationes Vergilianae des Claudius Donatus*. The commentary contains explanations of poetic expressions and metaphors, and of syntactical constructions. Antiquities are neglected, as usual until *Serv. Danielis*. The treatise is highly rhetorical.

260. C. Weyman, *Caput unguento deducere*. This expression, from *Paul. Nol. Epist.* XIII. 7, p. 90. 13, may be explained by the analogy of *crinem unguento deducere*; cf. *Stat. Silv.*

1. 2. 111 f. It is not necessary to assume a contamination of two constructions, as W. did in *Révue d'hist. et de litt. relig.* III (1898), 565.

261-274. A. Klotz, *Die Argumente zur Thebais des Statius*. Text with critical apparatus and notes on metre and language. The argumenta were written in Gaul between the fourth and the sixth centuries.

274. C. Weyman, *Habeat, teneat, possideat*. This legal formula occurs in *Plin. Epist.* 1. 16. 1.

275-283. Miscellen. O. Hey, *Noch einmal Actutum.—Actuarius*. While admitting the possibility of a derivation from *agere*, H. defends his etymology suggested in *ALL.* XI. 35 (*AJP.* XXIX. 354) against M. Pokrowskij, *Rh. M.* LXI. 185, citing examples from vulgar Latin of the change of *act-* to *att-(at-)*. The citation of *actuarius* by P. as evidence for the idea of speed in *ago* is a mistaken one; a better one would be *age (agite)*.

C. Weyman, *Sine ira et studio*. This phrase from *Tac. Ann.* 1. 1, which Leo, *Griechisch-römische Biographie*, p. 313, would find in Eusebius of Caesarea, is not parallel with the expression of Eusebius, and besides is not original with Tacitus.

K. Hoppe, *Vergiliana*. Corrections of Georgii, *Die antike Aeneiskritik* and *Die antike Vergilkritik in den Bukolika und Georgika*, with notes on glosses which throw light on the scholia to Vergil.

M. Wisén, *Zum historischen Infinitiv*. Originally a perfect form. *Amare*, for example, was related to *amavere* as *amarunt* is to *amaverunt*. It was used in colloquial Latin, and its origin was lost sight of. This view explains the use of the *nom.* as subject and the fact that the *hist. inf.* is commonly found in the present active.

284-294. Review of the Literature for 1906. 1907.

295. Necrology. W. v. Hartel.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

PHILOLOGUS, Bd. LXVIII (N. F. Bd. XXII), 1909.

I, pp. 1-51. L. Jeep, *Priscianus*. Continued from Vol. LXVII, pp. 21-51. Contributions to the history of the transmission of Roman literature. Priscian probably owes most of his citations from the oldest Latin literature to Fl. Caper whom he freely excerpted.

II, pp. 52-70. W. Gilbert, *Der zweite Teil des Logos der Diotima in Platons Gastmahl* (cap. 24-29, pag. 204 C—212 A.).

These chapters develop the working (*ἔργα*) and uses (*χρεία*), that is, the aim of Love, while in the preceding chapters its attributes and appearance are treated. In this article the course of thought is first sketched and then certain points are illustrated. I. The wider meaning (*εἶναι*) and narrower use (*καλεῖσθαι*) of the word *ἔρως*, c. 24-25. II. The Eros of a Socrates is the real subject, the Eros of the great teacher, a yearning after spiritual immortality without belief in the hereafter. From this followed as the peculiarity of the Symposium; (1) in place of transcendental immortality of the soul, (relative) earthly immortality must be substituted. (2) The Eros of the philosopher must proceed genetically out of the Eros of the teacher, yet in such a way that the former is to be conceived from the very beginning, nay, in physical attraction to the beautiful person, as the chiefly unconscious though real goal of endeavor for the man as he struggles in his mysterious desire. (3) The dialectic conceptual development could be given only for an *ἔρως ἀθανασίας* without belief in a hereafter (through *τόκος ἐν καλῷ*) whereas it could not suit the pure Platonic *ἔρως*. Whether for this also the way of conceptual development is at least hinted, is a question to be raised later.

III, pp. 71-87. Th. Stangl, Bobiensia. New contributions to the scholia Bobiensia of Cicero. The additions of the second hand in the Vatican leaves originate from a manuscript. In about a dozen passages in the Miloniana corrections are made in a sixth century semi-uncial. The words which are supplied were omitted by the first copyist owing to a homoioteleuton.

IV, pp. 88-117. G. Friedrich, Zu Martial. In Spect. 21, 8 read: haec tamen, haec res est facta ita, ficta alia. In I 67, 2 read: in te qui dicit, Ceryle: 'liber homo est'? IV 25, 6 read: haurit. Punctuate IV 58, 1, in tenebris lugens amissum, Galla. maritum? In V 24, 13 read: casside lucida. V 38, 3 read: seca . . . μέριζε. In V 78, 31 with Claudiam supply cenam, and interpret like Hor. Epp. I 5, 27, priorem = taking place earlier. In VI 14, 4 retain non scribat, as in I praef. and I 55, 13. In VI 58, 2 read: sidera ferre. Interpret VII 73 by starting from the Aventine (hinc v. 3). There are three houses, three prospects. Illinc (v. 3) is from the Esquiline; then follows a chiasmic order. In VIII 51, 21—as Martial pronounced Instanti as though it were Istanti, he can say in v. 25 that he would drink seven not eight cyathi as a toast. In IX 61, 5 aedibus in mediis = cavaedium: vss. 13-14 should be read between 12 and 15: vs. 17 refers to a visit of host and guests to the place of banqueting. In XII 21, 7 read: nec cito; in V 82, 4 ni tu, dispeream, Gaure, etc.; in VIII 30, 7 read: quod si rapta; in XII 32, 12 read: corneaque laterna. XIII 65 refers to the partridge.

V, pp. 118-151. R. Eisler, Kuba-Kybele. Comparative investigations in the history of the religion of Asia Minor. The

cultnames (Ka'aba Χαμάρ, Χαβάρ, etc.) must once have been spread through the whole domain of west-semitic civilization and contain the key to the understanding of the name as well as the original nature of the great Mother of the gods of Asia Minor. A suggestive series of etymologies and parallels is given. The discussion is continued pp. 161-209.

Miscellen.

1. pp. 152-154. G. Lippold. Mythographisches. The fragment from Herculaneum (Coll. alt. VIII 105) contains a new authority for Epicurean polemic against the mythological tradition and for estimating the value of the "mythological manual".

2. pp. 154-157. W. Soltau, 'Ρῶμος und Remus. Remus is neither a linguistic nor arbitrary differentiation of 'Ρῶμος. As the older Romulus (of the recorded first foundation of Rome) received as brother a Rōmos, so the later Romulus received Rēmus. This was too subtle for the Greeks who remained content with their 'Ρῶμος καὶ 'Ρωμύλος. Naevius could not use the rejected Romos so he had to choose a new name for the twin brother.

3. pp. 157-160. P. Maas, Kurz- und Langzeile in der Auspicianischen Strophe. The type is: Rex aeterne domine rerum creator domine qui es ante secula semper cum patre filius. In several of these hymns the first and third short lines are handled more freely than the second and fourth. Examples are given where this fact is important in restoring the text.

VI, pp. 161-209, R. Eisler, Kuba-Kybele. Enough agreement between the Kybele cult of Asia Minor and the Arabian Ka'aba cult has been proved to set in a new light the part taken by the semitic element in the heterogeneous civilization of Asia Minor.

VII, pp. 210-228, W. Schultz. 'Εφέσια und Δελφικά γράμματα. Starting from Roscher's analysis in Philol. LX (1901), p. 81 ff., the writer establishes a parallelism in the number of letters in the sayings and verses; in the inner symmetry of the arrangement on the basis of which they are counted; and in the numerical symbolism and division of the component parts, that is to say, the number of letters in both series is a multiple of the number of parts and the number sacred to the particular divinity, i. e., the 7 of Apollo, the 6 of Artemis. The Ephesian letters form an hexameter:

αἴσια δαμνεμενὺς τέτραξ λίξ ἄσκι κατάσκι.

The philosophy of Heraclitus of Ephesus affords a commentary on these detached words: The fiery sun who subdues the universe (δαμνεμενὺς) calls forth in the fourfold seasons (τέτραξ) upon earth (λίξ) the alternation of night (ἄσκι) and day (κατάσκι); for this is true (αἴσια).

VIII, pp. 229-259. C. Ritter, Die politischen Grundanschauungen Platons, dargestellt im Anschluss an die Politeia. A clearly written outline of the chief points of the Republic, put in rather free order to emphasize the relative importance of several hitherto almost neglected characteristics.

IX, pp. 260-270. Th. Steinwender, Der Quincunx im römischen Heere zur Zeit der Manipularstellung. There really was a quincunx formation in the line of scrimmage within certain limits, but not a quincunx of manipulares.

X, pp. 271-317. O. Haberleitner, Studien zu den Acta imperatorum Romanorum. I. The formulas in the edicts and letters of the emperors from Augustus to Hadrian. The acta were of seven kinds. I. Private letters, II (a) edicta (b) orationes (c) adlocutiones, III (a) epistulae (of public nature) (b) rescripta (c) subscriptiones, IV (a) decreta (b) interlocutiones (II, III, IV were called *constitutiones*), V mandata, VI leges datae, VII privilegia militum veteranorumque de civitate et conubio. The writer discusses the transmission, publication, collection, the internal peculiarities of each class of documents.

Miscellen.

4. p. 318, C. E. Gleye, Die Weltkarte des Agrippa. He would propose in Plin. N. H. 3, 17 ex delineatione for ex destinatione.

5. p. 319-320. O. Probst, Zu Martial III 58, 12 pp., picta perdix must be the fowl called *attagen*.

XI, pp. 321-331. J. Sitzler, Der Koer Kadmos. Kadmos of Kos (Herod. VII 163) was the son of Skythes, tyrant of Kos, who became later ruler of Zankle in Sicily, of which the Samians took possession in 493 B. C. Before Skythes left Kos he passed his throne over to his son Kadmos. This probably occurred about the time of the beginning of the Ionian revolt. Later Kadmos succeeded in restoring the Samians, who had formerly been driven out of Zankle by Anaxilas.

XII, pp. 332-343. C. Ritter, Platonica. The writer considers several points which he passed over in his larger work on the life and writings of Plato (Neue Untersuchungen über Platon), points resulting from his study of the so-called Platonic letters.

(1) Although Epist. XIII is spurious, the allusion to Plato's nieces is likely to be correct, as they would be well known at Athens, when the letter was presumably written. The statement (Diog. Laert. III 2 f. and Index Herculaneensis Col. II 33 ff.) that Plato died at a feast is corroborated, thinks Ritter, by a scholium in the Herculane. Pap., from which he conjectures that the feast was the wedding of his niece.

(2) Comparing Alkiphron IV 7 (Schepers) and Plut. Mor. 59 b, Ritter is inclined to emend *ὥσπερ κοχλίας* to *ὑπὲρ κροτάφους* in the

lines of Amphis (Diog. L. III 28) describing the severe look of Plato.

(3) The portrait-busts of Plato. We do not know today how Plato really looked.

XIII, pp. 344-367. S. Eitrem, *De Mercurio Aristophaneo*. The purpose of the writer is to convince scholars that in his portraying of Hermes, Aristophanes has faithfully expressed the divine nature of the god even in minor details, has upon occasions turned the epithets of the divinity to his own use, and has pictured a Hermes quite after the fancy of the Athenians, as the servant of the Olympians. He has also borrowed somewhat from Aeschylus and the author of the Homeric hymn, and possibly portions of an older comedy.

XIV, pp. 368-395. O. Gilbert, *Aristoteles und die Vorsokratiker*. Diels, in his *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, did not include opinions which are not referred by Aristotle to particular philosophers. But it is important to establish that Aristotle aims to characterize sharply the several schools according to their peculiar teachings, and so to place the different theories side by side. So the Ionians, Eleatics, Pythagoreans, Atomists, Platonics appear as closed schools; but Empedokles and Anaxagoras appear everywhere as the heads of two schools. In this article Gilbert collects the general opinions of Aristotle on the older schools. The doctrines here treated are those that serve to establish their view of the world and conception of Nature.

These views fall into two categories: I. *μία ἀρχή* (i. e. the *ὑλη* absolutely) either (1) *κινουμένη* or (2) *ἀκίνητος*. II. *πλείους ἀρχαί* (i. e. the *ὑλη* from the beginning divided *κατὰ φύσιν*). (1) In limited number (2, 3, or 4) or (2) in unlimited number (*ἄπειροι*) and these last (*ἄπειροι*) again either (a) *τὸ γένος ἓν* or (b) *ἐναντία*. Before Aristotle no one correctly treated of purpose. For Aristotle insists that the idea of purpose to which as to the highest principle all cosmic being is subject can be explained only from the distinction of a transitory and an intransitory world. The failure to make such a distinction is the vital error from which according to Aristotle's judgment the whole pre-Socratic philosophy suffers.

XV, pp. 396-409. M. Manitius, *Erchanberts von Freising Donatkommentar*. He was bishop in 835-853 and this work of his seems to be earlier than Hraban's grammar. Although no new grammatical sources are to be gained from this Donatus commentary, yet it is worth closer examination because of the interest in such studies in the South among the East Franks, and because of the treatment of the sources. He had a larger body of source-material at his disposal than had Hraban, whose work rests chiefly on Priscian, Diomedes and Beda.

XVI, pp. 411-427. F. Reuss, *Der erste punische Krieg*. A defence of his statements in *Philol. N. F. XIV*, 102-148, about the origin of our tradition concerning the first Punic War, and certain chronological arguments, which had been assailed by Varese, Beloch, Schermann, Eliaeson, Luterbacher and Leuze.

XVII, pp. 428-444. W. Aly, *Karer und Leleger*. An attempt to establish the Greek tradition about these peoples from the literary material and support it by archaeological data, as a step towards helping to unravel the ethnological problem presented by the Cretan-Mycenaean civilization. The Carians came to the mainland from the islands; for of old as subjects of Minos under the name "Leleges", they had occupied the islands. Although an original relationship of Cretans and Leleges with the people of Asia Minor cannot be denied, the bond was early broken. Only Lycia, Labraunda, Troas, Tenedos et al. appear to be remains of the ancient stock.

Miscellen.

6. pp. 445-446. P. Maas, *Ὑδάτη*. In the boat song from Oxyrhynchus vs. 4, the reading is shown by the meter to be correct; for the meter, the same as in a 4th cent. baptismal hymn, requires a final paroxytone and almost all final syllables are long. From this identity of meter we get light on the fact that Areios disseminated his religious ideas in boat-songs, miller-songs and the like.

7. pp. 446-447. J. Baunack, *Zu Thuk. I 24, 3*. The reading ἀπελθόντες, with or without ἐπ' οἴκου can mean ἐπανελθόντες. μετὰ τῶν βαρβάρων belongs to both verbal ideas in the sentence and Thuk. has condensed from: οἱ δὲ ἀπελθόντες ἀπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐπ' οἴκου μετὰ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐλήζοντο τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει.

8. pp. 447-448. M. Schneider, *Zu Vergils Eclog. I 59, 60*. The reading *aequore* for *aethere* is paralleled by Archilochus (ap. Stob. *Florileg. CX 10* = Bergk *P. L. G.*⁴, 74, 31) which is probably the original for Vergil: δελφῖνες corresponds to *pisces*; θῆρες to *cervi*; ἡπειρος and ὄρος to *in litore* and νομός ἐνάλιος and ἡχέοντα κύματα to an *in aequore* in Vergil. Cf. also the imitation in Nemesianus *Eclog. I 75 freto*.

XVIII, pp. 449-455. L. Radermacher, *Griechischer Sprachbrauch* (cf. *Philologus LXV, N. F. XIX 142 ff.*).

18. ἐν ἐπιφανεστάτῳ in Bechtel, *Sammlung der gr. Dialektinschriften 3380 Z 12* = ἐπιφανέστατα. Cf. *Philostrat. Vita Apollon. V 29, p. 96* and *VII, 11, p. 111*. The use of the plural is slightly different in *Oxyr. Pap. III 478, 34 ἐν ὑπερετέσιν* 'at the age of more than sixty years'; the plural makes it easier. The Hellenistic εἰαυτῷ = "für sich" also occurs as ἐν εἰαυτῷ in the prooemium of the book of Sirach.

19. Two Ionisms. *πολλόν* with a comparative is correct in Phoenix of Colophon ap. Athen. 530 E and Soph. Ant. 86. In Soph. Oed. Col. 1135 read *ἐμπήροις* with Hense. As an obiter dictum, Eurip. Troad. 1331 is emended to *ἰώ, τάλαινα, μόλις ὁμως δὲ πρόφερε πόδα*, etc.

20. In the poem of Antipatros in Oxyr. Pap. IV 662 Col. III *αὐτονέον δέρμα* means 'das Ideal eines frischen Fells'. *αὐτό* through influence of philosophic terminology came to have the meaning of 'concept' among later writers, cf. Lucian diall. meretr. 14, 4 *ὄνος αὐτό λυρίζων*; and Alciphron III 24, 2 *αὐτό σκαπανεύς ἐδόκουν*.

XIX, pp. 456-463. Eb. Nestle, Spiritus asper und lenis in der Umschreibung hebräischer Wörter. The subject needs thorough investigation. That Abraham and Abimelech, both beginning with aleph, should appear in Greek, the former with smooth, the latter with rough breathing, is due to the fact that in the latter case the aspiration has passed from the middle of the word to the initial vowel; so from Jehuda we have (*ουχ*) *Ἰουδα* in the MSS. Nestle then considers hallelujah and hosanna, both of which in Greek should have the spiritus lenis. A more thorough study from a complete collection of data is needed.

XX, pp. 464-487. A. Müller, Die Neujahrsfeier im römischen Kaiserreiche. A most entertaining study of the ancient New Year's Day celebrations; the shift from March 1 to Jan. 1 with the change of calendar and induction of magistrates; the sources for the study, isolated passages in earlier writers, copious references from Ovid down, especially detailed accounts in the fourth century from Church fathers who combated the popular fondness for secular amusements. All ranks of society indulged in this festival in almost every sort of merrymaking from presents (*strenae*) and calls of congratulation, to antics, mummary and superstitious rites.

XXI, pp. 488-499. W. Schultz, Herakles am Scheidewege. (1) This story is an alphabetical allegory which receives its peculiar coloring and its relation to older myths through traditions respecting the invention of the alphabet. (2) The institution of the Ephebia seems to have presupposed an arrangement of four periods of life of 20 years each, corresponding to the four seasons, and was then brought into connection with the numerical symbolism of the alphabetic series. (3) The history of the *litera Pythagorica vel philosophica* affords a glimpse into an hitherto obscure Pythagorean legend which was affected by Etruscan influence. (4) The letter Y acquired an association already current in mythology of 'path of life' and 'tree of life'. In the peculiar form in which it mediates between the traditions about the *litera Pythagorica* and those on which Prodicus' allegory is based, it is suited to make a new link in the chain which connects the Etruscans in Italy and the Lydians in Asia Minor.

XXII, pp. 500-522. K. Bitterauf. Die Bruchstücke des Anonymus Iamblichi. The writer is a sophist whose ethical and political philosophy corresponds to that of the Prometheus myth in the Protagoras. This myth is taken to be not a free creation of Plato, but an exploitation of some existing document. The Abderite Protagoras may have been the author. The claims of other sophists are considered and set aside.

XXIII, pp. 523-528. A. Ruppersberg, Ueber zwei Horazstellen. (1) *Relicta non bene parmula* in Carm. II 7, may be taken literally. It is shown that Roman officers did carry shields. Horace might console himself for the loss and his own fright by thinking of the experiences of Archilochus, Alcaeus and Anacreon. We can pardon the weakness shown by a twenty-three year old youth under the stress of an overpowering fate. But we should stop giving the poet's words an artificial sense, Lessing, Kiessling, Aly, and others to the contrary notwithstanding.

(2) In Carm. II 18, 38 ff., hic levare functum pauperem laboribus . . . vocatus atque non vocatus audit, he emends to *audet* = cupit, vult, dignatur. This certainly seems to remove the obvious difficulties of the passage.

XXIV, pp. 529-536. K. Hartmann, Das Verhältnis des Lucretius Carus zur Musik. Lucretius may be classed as a man of strong musical temperament, though perhaps without technical knowledge of the art. His references to music from the songs of birds to the organ are passed in review.

XXV, pp. 537-549. W. Anderson, Zu Apuleius' Novelle vom Tode der Charite (Met. VIII c. 1-14). The original form of the story seems to be in a Tatar-Caucasian version, closely connected with which are two Armenian variants, another Tschetschenian, and two stories in Plutarch Mulier. virtut. s. Κάμψα and Amator. 22 (ed. Bernardakis II, p. 234-236; IV, p. 452 sq.). The Kriemhild saga in the second half of the Nibelungenlied is quite similar also. The hypothesis of Maass and Bürger that Apuleius has contaminated the Protesilaos saga in the Euripidean Version with the Atyslegend (Herodot. I 34-45) goes too far in the light of the Plutarch passages, although Apul. may have borrowed single motives from Euripides.

XXVI, pp. 550-559. O. Probst, Glossen aus Cassius Felix. Striking comparison of the garbled glosses in *Hermeneumata Cod. Vatic. 1260 Saec. X* (Corp. Gloss. ed. Goetz, III, p. 549 sqq.) with Cassius Felix.

XXVII, pp. 560-568. D. Heeringa, Noch einmal de Divinatione. Sander's hypothesis of an anonymous editor after Cicero's death (Quaestiones de Cic. libris quos scripsit de Div. 1908) is superfluous. His notion that Cicero had originally planned but a single book de Div. is refuted by de Fato 1.

Miscellen.

9. pp. 569-572. J. Sundwall, Zwei attische Dekrete. (1) Nr. 375 in the Mus. at Athens, of the 3d cent., an honorary decree for the astynomoi who had merited praise for a procession. (2) Inv. nr. 387, first cent. decree in honor of the prytanies and their magistrates.

10. pp. 572-573. W. Weyh, Astrologisches in der griechisch-orthodoxen Liturgie? A comparison of catal. cod. Graec. astr. IV 99 with the Parakletike would seem to point to the latter's having influenced the former, rather than *vice versa*.

11. pp. 573-575. K. Lincke, Zu Demokritos *περὶ εὐθυμίας*. In frg. 3 Diels, 163 Natorp for *αἰρεῖσθαι*, read *αἶρεσθαι*.

12. pp. 575-577. K. Preisendanz, Zum Pariser Zauberpapyrus der bibl. nat. suppl. gr. 574. The separate leaves now glued into book-form were originally double leaves which became separated, when the middle of the papyrus broke.

13. p. 578. B. A. Müller, Zu Lycophrons Nachleben. Two misstatements in Christ's Hdbch. d. gr. Litt. are corrected. Jos. Scaliger's translation was first printed in 1566 at Basel, and it was Reichard who imitated Lycophron's poem in his edition of 1788.

14. p. 579. O. Crusius, *Vetulam facere* und die *dies vetulae*. The former = vitulam f. and refers to masquerading as a calf; the latter refers to Anna Perenna, the goddess of the year.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

BRIEF MENTION.

Some titles carry with them the pith of the whole sermon, the whole essay that they head. So Dr. Chalmers' 'Expulsive Power of a New Affection', though to be sure 'clavus clavum pellit' would have answered as well. So Lowell's 'On a Certain Condescension in Foreigners'—a title that often comes up to my mind when those who are not professional Hellenists patronize Greek, while they revile the methods by which alone the inner shrine of Hellenism can be reached. Given a little facile eloquence, even a little journalistic deftness, and anybody can say pretty things about Greek, as anybody can say pretty things about Mpongwe. Years ago I declined to be under everlasting obligations to Du Bois-Reymond when he made amends for his assault on Greek exercises (Essays and Studies, p. 57) by a generous recognition of the 'world-riddles' that the Greek propounded for the first time and for all time. My heartstrings are rusty and do not vibrate to such fingerings. So the other day I was stopped in the street by a friend who informed me with genuine sympathy that a famous literary physician had published an article in the American Magazine for December in which he expressed his high appreciation of Greek study. I must confess that the news left me as cold as when Victor Hugo announced his belief in God, especially as I suspected that Dr. OSLER's laudation of Greek had been coupled with his usual fling at the poor brothers of the guild to which I belong (A. J. P. XXX 108). But the grammarians were spared this time and I tried to be grateful for being told that 'Man's redemption of man is the great triumph of Greek thought' and that 'The tap-root of modern science sinks deep in Greek soil, the astonishing fertility of which is one of the outstanding facts of history'. Nay, I was grateful because these fine sentences carried me back to my hot youth when I was in the missionary field and preached the doctrine of the Necessity of the Classics.

But I am out of that business and sometime ago when I had a fine opportunity to laud and magnify Greek and Greek studies, I deliberately renounced the attempt (Hellas and Hesperia, p. 20), for he who has heard with the spiritual ear the bright clear note of the Greek flute does not care for those who try to repeat it, whether on penny whistle or ophicleide, nay, hardly listens to the silver trumpet of Renan, who says in his *Peuple d'Israël*:

La Grèce seule découvrit la stabilité des lois de la nature. La Grèce découvrit le secret du beau et du vrai, la règle, l'idéal. Désormais il n'y aura plus qu' à se mettre à l'école; c'est ce que Rome fera, c'est ce que après chaque recrudescence de la barbarie feront les auteurs des renaissances sans fin.

However, Dr. OSLER's Redemption of Man is not so much a laudation of Greek as a deification of the writer's own profession. Now I have all respect for the χρυσᾶ ἔπη of the successors of Demokedes' and Demokedes' valet, and in the matter of deification I am of the mind of the Lacedaemonians who said, 'Since Alexander wishes to be a god, let him be a god'. Yet I was somewhat startled by one of Dr. OSLER's proof-texts, startled by what he calls 'the memorable phrase of Prodicus', 'That which benefits human life is God'. Now every grammarian has a warm place in such heart as he has for Prodicus, the arch-synonymmonger, the fellow-islander of Simonides and Bakchylides, Prodicus of Keos, the only spot in Greek territory where suicide was fashionable, and so the right abode for the grammarian. Any phrase of his is worth remembering. But this memorable phrase is not to be found in Philodemus, our oldest witness, nor in Cicero, our most convenient witness, nor in Sextus Empiricus—all cited in Diels's *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 'Quid?' says Cicero, who follows Philodemus (N. D. 1, 42, 118), 'Prodicus Cius, qui ea, quae prodessent hominum vitae, deorum in numero *habita esse* dixit, quam tandem religionem reliquit?' An echo of this sentiment is ascribed to one Persaeus (l. c., 15, 38) 'eos dicit *esse habitos* deos, a quibus magna utilitas ad vitae cultum esset inventa, ipsasque res utiles et salutares deorum esse vocabulis nuncupatas'. 'Habita esse'—'esse habitos'. Poor Prodicus's shallow theory as to the origin of the gods is bad enough without making him responsible for the sentiment 'That which benefits human life is God'. 'I think nobly of the <gods> and no way approve his opinion' says substantially Malvolio-Cicero; and 'the memorable phrase of Prodicus' is not the phrase of Prodicus but the phrase of that gay master of winged words, GUILLAUME L'OISELEUR dit OSLER.

For the public to which the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY—or, as a friend has dubbed it, the American Journal of Mephistophily—addresses itself, the allusion to Demokedes is not a recondite allusion. But in this age of ours the allusive style is pronounced the worst of all styles, and, in point of fact, it has been called the chief representative of 'le genre ennuyeux'—another recondite allusion, I suppose. On the same principle, Matthew Arnold has been taken to task for his frequent use of Scriptural language, which will soon be put in the category of recondite allusions. To an old-fashioned man like myself it seems perfectly justifiable to make any allusion whatever, so long as the surface sense is plain enough (A. J. P. XXXI 487). But, of course, every now and then when I think I am on safe ground I transgress my own law, as I did some years ago when, writing for the Atlantic Monthly, I alluded to the coat-of-arms of Massa-

chusetts, with its motto 'Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem'. 'The brandished sword', I wrote, 'would have shown what manner of *placida quies* SHE would have ensued if demands had been made on Massachusetts at all commensurate with the Federal demands on Virginia'. The little word 'she' was omitted and the sentence spoiled. But in my old age I 'seek peace and ensue it' (i Pet. 3, 11). However, as I have mentioned Demokedes, I may as well make an exception to my usual tirade against translations. I have in my time derived so much pleasure from Lange's translation of Herodotos into the racy language of Luther's Bible that I made sundry experiments in the same line, and the old French translations of Greek authors have a charm of their own. So I dip every now and then into Pierre Saliat's version of Herodotos (1556). It is not Amyot, but it is not bad. Unfortunately Saliat's rendering of the passage under consideration (Hdt. 3, 130) is singularly, in fact inexplicably, incorrect, and it is a pity that M. Eugène Talbot when he revived Saliat in his edition of 1864 did not correct the translation, as he professed to do, instead of modernizing the spelling.

La cure faicte de tout point, Daire lui fit present de deux couples de chaines d'or, lesquelles recevant il dit: 'Entendez-vous, Sire, par ces cadenes, que la fortune d'esclave me redouble pour vous avoir gueri?' Le roi prit plaisir en la parole, et l'envoya vers ses femmes. Les eunuques qui le conduisoient dirent aux dames qu'il estoit celuy qui avoit rendu la vie au roi. Adonc chascune d'elles, pour sa caresse, lui donna un vase d'or avec l'estuy, present si bien fourni et si plantureux qu'un page, nommé Sciton, ramassa grande somme d'or en recueillant les dariques qui tomberent des vases en les secouant pour mieulx entasser et agencer les pieces.

The mention of Dr. OSLER recalls our divergent estimates of Eryximachos (A. J. P. XXX 109) and Eryximachos recalls the famous sentence of the man in Athenaeus xv 666 A: *εἰ μὴ ἰατροὶ ἦσαν, οὐδὲν ἂν ἦν γραμματικῶν μωρότερον*, for Eryximachos was both physician and grammarian in the old *γραμματικός* sense. Substitute for *γραμματικῶν* the kindred word *ἐτυμολογικῶν* and behold a fitting introduction to what one of my contributors has to say about Mr. GEORGE O. HOLBROOKE'S *Aryan World-Building*. The Knickerbocker Press, New York.

'It is impossible', says Dr. FRANKLIN EDGERTON, 'to treat seriously a book which holds to the old three-vowel system for Indo-European, "splitting" *a* into *a e o* in Greek, etc., knows no later authority than Curtius, and uses worse than Curtian methods of etymology from beginning to end. Except as a fund of philological humour, it is so much waste paper. Here is one sample (Introduction, p. 5): "Losing the sibilant, *sthā* becomes (*thā*), which the Sanskrit replaces, according to its regular rule (!), by *dhā*—*Dhā* hardens into *dā* (to bestow, give), the roots *dhā* and *dā* melting into each other in a remarkable way in the Teu-

tonic languages", etc., etc. In this truly 'remarkable way' all the words of the Indo-European languages could be arranged in one long, beautiful etymological line'.

And then Dr. EDGERTON goes on to lament the waste of so much good money, when so many impecunious young doctors cannot afford to have their dissertations printed—dissertations, alas! which the advance of science will surely leave behind. Dr. EDGERTON's lament reminds me of a similar ejaculation of my own (A. J. P. XIV 260) touching the magnificence of Mr. EUSTACE HAMILTON MILES'S *Comparative Syntax of Latin and Greek*, appearing as it did 'clad in the sumptuous raiment of the Cambridge University Press, while Professor Fraccaroli has been hoping and praying for a publisher all these years, and hoping and praying in vain'. But Fraccaroli's Pindar was published at last (A. J. P. XV 501) and Eustace Miles became a great man at tennis.

The few survivors among the pioneers of statistical syntax have often occasion to recall Goethe's Magician's Prentice as they watch the decimal deviltry of recent investigators and shudder at the inevitable swamping of the fair fields of literature by these arithmetical deposits. Once in this line of business, however,—the Germans call it 'Mache',—it is impossible to resist the fascination of the process, impossible also for a certain order of mind not to try to get something out of the figures. On the scientific side some of the most palpable blunders have been made in the manipulation of said figures (A. J. P. XXV 104) and scholars have actually forgotten that Iliad and Odyssey are not of the same length, and as one concerned chiefly with the aesthetic side of the study, I ask myself now as I have asked myself before: Is it possible, or if possible, is it desirable to acquire a sensitiveness that can distinguish such minute details as have been used to stratify the language of Thukydides, Xenophon, Plato? If there is no feeling, all these figures are valueless for art, however valuable for science. Now the study of rhythm seems to be going the way of syntax. In the old times we were told that the small number of γένη is due to the fact that the ear cannot readily discern subtle proportions of arsis and thesis so that we have only γένος ἴσον, γένος διπλάσιον, γένος ἡμιόλιον, and even the γένος ἡμιόλιον is unfamiliar to the modern. But the study of prose rhythm has taught us a much greater variety. We are not content with the simple rule that the prose-writer must avoid those rhythms that are familiar to every ear by reason of the large use of them in poetry and that one must have a special care not to begin nor to end a sentence with a well-known poetical lilt, a well-known poetical cadence. The rule is of a piece with the dancing master's instructions how to enter a room, how to leave it. Cicero, as a master of stylistic

deportment, laid down some simple rules that ought to have been heeded, but, bless me, how few read Cicero's Orator in the days of which I am thinking, the days when a leading Latin scholar in his eagerness for an example of *aequalis* with the genitive resorted to the dictionary, the great quarry of school-grammars, and recklessly rendered, with a false reference to boot, Cicero's 'Creticus et eius aequalis Paeon', 'Creticus and his contemporary Paeon'. But such things are impossible now. The revived study of the Greek rhetoricians has changed all that and for the last two decades the refining process has gone on with ever-increasing minuteness, a minuteness that seems to defy what a friend of mine would call 'aural retention'. The whole thing has become a matter of digits, not a matter of ear. Now I do not wish to be understood as undervaluing research into the mysteries of *prosa numerosa*, but the signs of the times point to the introduction of the subject into elementary grammars; nay, the thing has already been perpetrated with a certain flourish of trumpets, and the business of analysis, already overdone, has added a new burden to the taskwork of the unlucky novice. The boy is forced to analyze before he has anything to analyze. Many years ago, myself a syntactician, I laid down as one of my three rules for beginners, Minimum of Syntax and myself a searcher after the *ῥῆθος* of rhythm (A. J. P. XVI 394), I protest against too much eurhythmy for boys. But, as I have said, the fascination of the subject for the professional scholar is undoubted, and I was much interested in a recent article which made the cretic the dominant note in the Ciceronian clausula. (See Draheim, W. f. K. Ph. 5 Dez. 1910 and cf. A. J. P. XXIX 372). But what space is there in *Brief Mention* for an adequate notice of ZANDER'S *Eurhythmia vel Compositio Rhythmica Prosae Antiquae*, the first part of which contains in nearly five hundred pages the *Eurhythmia Demosthenis*—with the record of his *initia* and his *clausulae* (Leipzig, Harrassowitz). But to pass it by in silence would seem to be a sin if there were not so many *ἄρτια Μουσῶν* at which the Journal must needs be mute.

Mr. STARKIE has a perfect right to amuse himself by his Shakespearian rendering of the *Acharnians*. One can never read the Elizabethan poets without recognizing the fact that the English language was at its richest then and if one desires to translate the lyric range of Greek poetry with its magnificent compounds, one must resort to the treasure-house of that opulent period (A. J. P. XXIII 467-9). No wonder that Professor Wood in writing of Beddoes (A. J. P. IV 445 fol.) gave his article the subtitle 'A Survival in Style', though with Beddoes the German influence must count, which to-day, in my judgment at least, is a sinister influence. The compounds that infest our scientific

journals, slavishly built as they are on German lines, have no organic unity. The terms of the surrender we made to our French masters centuries ago must be kept. 'Standpoint' is an abomination, 'viewpoint' is no better. But it is a sheer delight to see how Elizabethan English meets the conditions of higher Greek poetry and those who felt the charm of Greek compounds as is shewn in the well-known verses of Daniel, 'the learned Greek, rich in fit epithets, Blest in the lovely marriage of pure words' knew how to build them. But when we read Aristophanes we are not reading Lykophron nor studying Festus. Aristophanes is not a collection of glossematic Greek any more than Shakespeare is a collection of glossematic English. How many words has one to look up in a page of Shakespeare? The dreary business of statistics might help us here. At all events it is a violation of artistic law to render a word that is as familiar to a Grecian as the average of Shakespeare is to one born to the English tongue by some obsolete word that has to be fished up out of a glossary. The protest, I believe, has been made already, but such protests cannot be made too often. One I made myself years ago à propos of Conington's Persius, another à propos of Bevan's Prometheus (A. J. P. XXIII 467). 'Ἐφόδια is not 'sizes' or 'exhibition' nor *παῖδες* 'pajocks', nor *ἀλαζονεύμασιν* 'rope-tricks', nor *φαγεῖν τε καὶ πιεῖν* 'guzzling and potting', nor *ἐξαπατώμεθα* 'colted'. *Νεανίας* is not a 'rakehell' as Starkie renders it in v. 525, nor a 'princox' as he renders it in v. 685. *Νεανίας* has some color, as we can see from Plato, but not so much as Starkie gives it. 'Springald' is a fine old word. Why not translate *νεανίας* 'springald'? *καταρρέοντες* is translated 'a stream in spate'. 'Spate' is a good word, but it is a manner of English Doric and may be sent to keep company with Mr. Bevan's 'fleech' for *προσεύχου* (A. J. P. XXIII 469). The fact is, this blend of twentieth century slang and Elizabethan English reminds one too much of Bismarck's favorite beverage of champagne laced with beer.

When a generation ago I accepted the invitation of my friend, Professor MARCH, to take part in the preparation of the ill-judged and ill-fated Douglass Series (A. J. P. XXV 484), the world of patristic was all before me where to choose and I lingered long over the pages of John Chrysostom. However, it was against my principles to edit any part of an author without making myself acquainted with the bulk of his authorship and the works of Chrysostom proved to be too voluminous, but I used to refresh myself after the aridities of Justin's Dialogue with Tryphon by a dip in Chrysostom and in the Cappadocian Fathers, who had a special attraction for me, partly perhaps because like Pindar and others they belonged to a maligned territory—*τοῖς ἡσσοσιν γὰρ πᾶς τις εὐνοίας φέρει* (Essays and Studies, p. 355, Pindar, I. E. viii).

French writers of elementary manuals have not hesitated to draw upon the Fathers of the Church for examples of Greek Syntax and so I did not hesitate to utilize my patristic studies by getting up exercises based on Chrysostom. For those who desire to know more of that interesting period Chrysostom furnishes a rich quarry, haunted, it is true, but not exhausted, and some years ago Professor GELZER, of Jena, a specialist in Byzantine history, was happily inspired to set one of his American doctorands, Professor J. MILTON VANCE of Wooster, Ohio, the task of building up a *Byzantinische Culturgeschichte* out of the works of Chrysostom. Professor GELZER is dead and the Rev. Professor VANCE's dissertation is not in the trade, but he whose business it is to find subjects for doctoral dissertations will appreciate the relief to the teacher, the training for the student, the value of the compilation, and the immunity from qualified criticism, for few there be who know Chrysostom as Professor VANCE has learned to know him.

When we Americans indulge our national vein of mockery we are apt to fare ill at the hands of German critics unfamiliar with American conditions. In a review of Professor MORGAN'S *Addresses and Essays* (A. J. P. XXXI 243) a critic in the *Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie* (6 Juni 1910) takes the first paper on Persius seriously and so fails to understand MORGAN'S elaborate persiflage of the way in which certain scholars attempt to reverse traditional judgments. <Eine Studie,> he says, <die> mit wenig glücklichen Ausfällen gegen die 'Blindheit der Kommentatoren' und auf Grund von zum Teil recht wunderlichen Textinterpretationen, einen Wüstling übelster Art erkennen lassen will'. Even English scholars, who are more familiar with American ways, are puzzled by our ironies and in commenting on MORGAN'S book Mr. ROUSE in the number of the *Classical Review* for December, 1910, says: 'As for Persius Mr. MORGAN quite took in the present writer, who began to be indignant and to prepare an answer before he suddenly perceived that he was the victim of a hoax, or should I say a haze?' This would have rejoiced the heart of Professor MORGAN, who in this respect was an American of the Americans. My own misadventures in this line are too numerous to record.

In his interesting *Notice sur la vie et les travaux de Henri Weil* M. GEORGES PERROT records the devotion of the great Hellenist to the memory of his master and mine, if I dare say so, August Boeckh. I shall never forget how the face of the aged scholar lighted up when he spoke of the large portrait which Boeckh had presented to him and how he repeated to me with

slow emphasis the verse which the giver had inscribed under the likeness: *καλὸν τὸ θησαύρισμα κειμένη χάρις*. It is a rather prosaic line after all, and the version of Grotius makes it still more prosaic: *Benefacta bene locata, thesaurus gravis*. But the reflection on the 'fine investment' was quite in the vein of the author of the *Staatshaushaltung*. It is a verse of Menander's, as M. PERROT reminds us, at any rate a Menandrian verse, but it must not be sought in Kock, for Kock has bundled all the *γνώμαι μονόστιχοι* out of doors. Perhaps he did not like that other verse (A. J. P. XX 108): *ἀγαθὸν μέγιστον ἢ φρόνησις ἐστ' αἰεί*. Another teacher whom Weil and I had in common was Welcker. 'Personne', says M. PERROT, 'selon Weil, n' a eu, au même degré que Welcker, le sentiment et comme l'intuition de la haute antiquité'. Some years ago, recalling my various German teachers, I wrote: 'From Welcker's lectures on Greek art the world of classic beauty rose before me like an exhalation, perhaps rather too much like an exhalation. Still it was a golden mist'. And I was interested to find that Weil carried away the same impression, better equipped though he was than I. The reason is given by M. PERROT, himself an archaeologist of renown: 'C'est que Welcker ne disposait point d'une galerie de moulages et sans cette aide, sans un constant appel à des monuments mis sous les yeux des auditeurs, un cours d'histoire de l'art, quelque talent qu'y apporte le maître, ne laissera jamais dans l'esprit de ceux qui l'écoutent que des idées bien vagues'. Still much can be learned from the camera. Only there was no camera then. But on one small point of history I must set M. PERROT right. There was a fair collection of plaster casts at the University of Bonn long before the death of Welcker (December 17, 1868). I myself followed with lively interest the demonstrations of Johannes Overbeck, then at the beginning of his long career, and in the *Index Lectionum* for the summer of 1853 I read: *Gypsothecae monumenta illustrabit bis p. h. h. p. 1 Ioannes Overbeck*.

In ZACHER's posthumous edition of the *Peace of Aristophanes* I find a reference to an article of his in *Jhrb.* 1887, p. 536, in which he comments on v. 241, a notorious verse, which has been discussed repeatedly in the *Journal* XI 372, XXI 231, XXVII 230, 486. It runs thus:

ὁ δεινός, ὁ ταλαύρινος, ὁ κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν.

Whereupon Zacher remarks with a genuine Aristophanic laugh (v. 335) that the last designation would not have racked the brains of the commentators so much, if they had read besides the text the scholia and the remarks in Dindorf and Dübner, where we have *δεινός· συμβολικὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποπηδώντων*. (For *ἀποπηδώντων*

read with Schol. V. ἀποτιλώντων. Rutherford suggests ἀποπατούντων accepted by Sharpley.) This, I have frankly admitted, makes an effective παρὰ προσδοκίαν close to the verse, and gives the prosaic side of war in contrast to the poetical side ὁ δεινός, ὁ ταλαύρινος. But, as everyone knows the scholiasts are always sniffing out bad smells, so that if the thing were printable, I should like, to reproduce my Rabelaisian scholia on the part of Klytimestra in the Agamemnon, which I prepared some years ago as a protest against these malodorous discoveries, which are due in good measure to the morbid fancy of recluses, ancient and modern. Ancient and modern, for the moderns are no whit behind the ancients. Comp. v. 163 where σίτων, Porson's simple and natural correction for the unmetrical σιτίων has as its rivals Bentley's σκατίων and Von Velsen's πρωκτῶν. Mazon, it is true, expresses his regret that the much-lauded description of the charms of country life (v. 556 sqq.) is spoiled by the scholiast's *doubles ententes*, though he has to admit that almost all the products of the vegetable kingdom (A. J. P. XXII 470) mentioned in the passage are well-known equivalents of what Rutherford modestly called the *aedoea* (A. J. P. XIX 347). This being the case, I cannot hope to stem the current of scholiasts and critics; and I mention the matter simply to record another instance of the fatality that awaits too eager faultfinders (A. J. P. III 228, footn., XX 110-11). ZACHER was so busy with his criticism of the commentators on the Peace that he misquoted the passage and wrote τοῖν ποδοῖν, and I was so busy transfixing HEADLAM (A. J. P. XXXI 493, l. 43) that I overlooked the misprint οὐθ' ἐπιλείβων for οὐτ' ἐ. Misprint it was and not a contamination of οὐθ' ὑπολείβων and Schütz's οὐτ' ἐπιλείβων, as a good-natured friend suggests. Misprint it was, due to the tendency of typesetters and typewriters to uniformitarianism, but the charge of ablepsy abides as is the case with 'Chapman' for 'Chapman's', p. 489, l. 26, and p. 490, l. 22, 'comment' for 'commend'.

W. P. M.: Dr. ROBERT T. KERLIN'S *Theocritus in English Literature* (Lynchburg, Va., 1910) is a thoroughgoing study of all that the title implies. It begins with John Skelton's mention of "Theocritus with his bucolycall relacyons" (1523) and it gives a very careful list of translations, paraphrases, imitations (direct and indirect), quotations, and allusions, down to our own day. Even reviews are sometimes quoted, for, as the author cautiously observes, "these, in the main, exhibit on the part of the writer a knowledge of the text and an appreciation of the poetry of the Idylls". And, finally, there is a very useful list of classified bibliographies. Some of the allusions and quotations are not very important: for example, Robert Greene's two

quotations (p. 36), which no one has ever been able to find. And a good many of the "tributes" and appreciations come from people who have no very obvious right to speak in praise of Theocritus, or of any other Greek poet. But the great names also are there—Spenser, Ben Jonson, Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and the rest—and the monograph should be of great interest both to the student of English and to the student of Greek. On p. 11 Dr. KERLIN was in doubt whether the French pastoralists knew, or cared much for, Theocritus—a doubt which may have since been removed by an article in this Journal, XXX 245-274. On p. 13 he might have added an early mention of "famous Theocrite" from the Prologue to the Eglogues of Alexander Barclay (c. 1514). On p. 17 he seems to give undue prominence to what 'E. K.' says about the influence of Theocritus upon Spenser; some of E. K.'s statements are not very important, and some of them are not true. His remark, for example, that the name Phyllis "is usual in Theocritus" is neither important nor true. The poem to which he saw a resemblance in Spenser's March Eclogue is now ascribed, not to Theocritus, but to Bion. His statement that the October Eclogue is "made in imitation of Theocritus his xvi. Idilion" is distinctly misleading, and it must have been meant to be misleading. To be sure, he added—what most of his readers were likely to know—"and the lyke also is in Mantuane"; but it would doubtless be more impressive to refer a poem to a great Greek model than to the "homely Carmelite" whose Eclogues were a familiar text-book in almost every school. On p. 19 it might have been added that Spenser's November Eclogue, 43-46, is a very distinct echo—doubtless through Clément Marot—of Id. i, 23-25. On p. 95 the passage in Shelley's Adonais about the mourning Dreams owes much less to Theocritus than it does to the passage about the weeping Loves in Bion's Lament for Adonis. On p. 121 the "Theocritean" tone of the lines about Proserpina in Matthew Arnold's Thyrsis might better be explained by the passage of Moschus (Lament for Bion, 121-122) to which Arnold was doing his best to allude. On p. 184 Sidgwick's Virgil is set down as the most valuable edition for the student of Theocritus because of its "full list of parallel passages"—a list which Sidgwick expressly says is borrowed "from Ribbeck". On p. 142 it is hardly kind to our older teachers of Greek to say that "doubtless the chief means of making our poet known in America" was the prose translation by Mr. Andrew Lang. And on p. 159 it is at least premature to count Professor Gilbert Murray, of Oxford, as an American scholar. On p. 141 we are told that "in American papers and magazines the name of Theocritus is not to be found until within the last decade". But the Atlantic Monthly had a rather famous article on "Tennyson and Theocritus", by E. C. Stedman, in 1871.

SAMUEL HENRY BUTCHER,

APRIL 16, 1850—DECEMBER 29, 1910.

Thirty-one years ago I made for the first time the personal acquaintance of some of the lights of English classical scholarship. Of those whom I learned to know best, Jebb and Monro have been withdrawn from our firmament and now Butcher, the radiant, is gone. Butcher, many years my junior, was then in the first flush of achievement. My heart went out to the young scholar. Whose heart was ever closed to him? Our paths in life crossed more than once after that. Every point of meeting was for me an illumination. Every letter, every note was full of light. I can never read the First Pythian of Pindar without recalling the long letter he wrote me from Taormina. Taking up Verrall's Choephoroi the other day, I found the margin flecked with notes of the *curta supellex* order. *Curta supellex* is a better title for my *marginalia* than *Brief Mention*. But as I was about to transfer these notes to my collection of such trifles, my eye lighted upon Verrall's dedication of the book to Butcher. I dropped my pen and resumed it but to copy these words, 'No one will read the book with a more vigilant care for the poet or a kinder consideration for the editor'. Quite apart from the close personal relations of the two distinguished scholars, these words convey a great moral lesson, one that I might have taken to heart in my long series of animadversions on the work of better men. Vigilant care for the original, kind consideration for the interpreter—this is the spirit in which we ought all to work, a spirit of which Butcher was a shining example. For an estimate of what he achieved this is not the place. Some of his work I have characterized elsewhere. But it is the place for the expression of the grief that many feel on this side of the Atlantic, as on that, for the untimely passing of one who made life so much better worth living.

ἐκεῖνος ὅσα χάριματ' ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν,
τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναιτο;

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 80-82 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Aristotle. The works of; tr. into English under the editorship of J. A. Smith and W. D. Ross. Vol. II. *De generatione animalium*, by Arth. Platt. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1910. Various paging. 8°, pap., \$2.50.

Barss (J. E.) Writing Latin. Bk. 1.; rev. ed. Boston, *Heath*, 1910. 144 pp. 12°, cl., 50 c. net.

Bennett (C. E.) Syntax of Early Latin. Vol. I. The Verb. Boston, *Allyn & Bro.*, 1910 [1911]. 526 pp. 8°, \$4.

Caesar's Gallic war; books I-II and selections from V-VII; with introd., notes, and vocab., by J. C. Rolfe and A. W. Roberts. New York, *Scribner* 1910. 16+97+343+100 pp. Il. map. 12°, \$1.25.

Cicero's (M. T.) *De officiis libri tres*; by E. P. Crowell. 8d rev. ed. New York, *Hinds*, 1910. 6+7-347 pp. 16°, \$1.10.

Griggs (E. H.) The philosophy of Plato and its relation to modern life; New York, *Huebsch*, 1911. 50 pp. 12°, pap., 25 c.

Jenner (W. A.) and Wilson (H. E.) Caesar's first campaign; a beginner's Latin book. New York, *Appleton*, 1910. 3-18+312 pp. Il. 12°, \$1 net.

Keller (A. G.) Homeric society; a sociological study of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. New York, *Longmans*, 1911. 8+332 pp. 12°, \$1.20.

Pater (W.) Works. In 10 Vol. Vol. VIII. Greek studies. New York, *Macmillan*, 1910. 298; 7+161; 261 pp. 8°, cl., \$2 net.

Plutarch on education. Ed. by C. W. Super. Syracuse, N. Y., *C. W. Bardeen*, 1910. 102 pp. 12°, \$1.

Plutarch's *Cimon and Pericles*, with the funeral oration of Pericles; newly tr., with introd. and notes, by B. Perrin. New York, *Scribner*, 1910. 11+287 pp. Front. 8°, cl., \$2 net.

Sihler (E. G.) *Annals of Caesar*; a critical biography. New York, *Stechert*, 1911 [1910]. 9+380 pp. 8°, cl., \$1.75 net.

Smith (W. W.) A course in first year Latin. New York, *W. R. Jenkins Co.*, 1910. 8+365 pp. 12°, \$1.

Taciti, Cornelli, historiæ libri. *Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit C. D. Fischer.* (viii, 262 S.) 8°. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1911. 3s. 6d.

Tacitus' histories; bks. 1 and 2; ed. by F. G. Moore. New York, *Macmillan*, 1910. 8+249 pp. 16°, cl., 60 c. net.

Terenti (P. Afr.) *Hævton timorvmenos*; ed. with introd. and notes, by F. G. Ballentine. Boston, *B. H. Sanborn*, 1910. 21+129 pp. 12°, \$1.

Thucydides. History of the Peloponnesian war; done into English by R. Crawley; with 5 maps. New York, *Dutton*, 1910. 16+614 pp. 16° (Everyman's lib.), cl., 85 c. net; leath., 70 c. net.

Woodhouse (S. C.) English-Greek Dictionary. London, 1910. 1038 pp. 8°, 15s. net.

Xenophontis opera omnia; ed. E. C. Marchant. 4 Vol. Vol. I, Historia Graeca; Vol. II, Libri Socratici; Vol. III, Anabasis; Vol. IV, Institutio Cyri. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1910. 8° (Oxford classical texts), Vol. I, 75 c.; Vol. II, 90 c.; Vol. III, 75 c.; Vol. IV, cl., 90 c.; pap., 75 c.

— Anabasis. Bks. 1–4; ed., with introd., notes and vocab., by M. W. Mather and Jos. W. Hewitt. New York, *American Book Company*, 1910. 516 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.50.

FRENCH.

Aymès (Noel). Hellas, la Grèce antique. Paris, 1910. 16°, 3 fr. 50 c.

Duquesne (J.) La translatio iudicii dans la procédure civile romaine, in-8°. *Larose et Tenin*. 7 fr.

Nestorius. Le livre d'Heraclide de Damas, traduit par F. Nau, avec le texte grec des trois homélies en trois appendices (xxviii–402 pp.), in-8°. *Letouzey et Ané*. 10 fr.

Papillon (J.) Traduction en vers des églogues de Virgile, 22×14. *G. Ficker*. 2 fr. 50.

Reinach (Salomon). Répertoire de la statuaire grecque et romaine. T. IV, 4.000 grav., in-12. *E. Leroux*. 5 fr.

GERMAN.

Catullus (Valerius). In deutscher Übertragung nebst Erläuterungen v. M. Schuster. 2. Aufl. (xi, 276 S.) 8°. M. Ostrau, *R. Papauschek*; Wien, *R. Lechner & Sohn*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 4.20.

Ciceronis, M. Tulli, ad M. Brutum et M. Bruti ad M. Tullium Ciceronem epistularum liber nonus. Rec. H. Sjögren. (vii, 60 S.) gr. 8°. Upsaliae, 1910. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*. nn. 1.75.

Erbe, das, der Alten. Gesammelt u. hrsg. v. O. Crusius, O. Immisch, Th. Zielinski. Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich*. 1. Heft. *Treu (Geo.)* Hellenische Stimmungen in der Bildhauerei v. einst u. jetzt. 1. u. 2. Aufl. (xi, 52 S. m. 62 Abbildgn. u. 1 Taf.) 1910. 1.80; geb. 2.50; in Perg. 5.

Forschungen zur griechischen u. lateinischen Grammatik, hrsg. v. Paul Kretschmer, Frz. Skutsch, Jac. Wackernagel. gr. 8°. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. 1. Heft. *Lautensach (O.)* Die Aoriste bei den attischen Tragikern u. Komikern. (iv, 309 S.) 1911. 10 m.

Franchi de' Cavalieri (Pius). u. Ioha. Lietzmann: Specimina codicum graecorum vaticanorum. (50 Taf. m. XVI S. Text.) Lex. 8°. Bonnae, 1910. Bonn, *A. Marcus & E. Weber*. geb. in Leinw. 6; Vorzugsausg. b 12.

Gudeman (Alfr.) Imagines philologorum. 160 Bildnisse aus der Zeit von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart. (40 S. Abbildgn. m. VIII S. text.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 8.20; geb. 4.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrg. von Dr. Iwan v. Müller. Lex. 8°. München, *C. H. Beck*. IX. Bd. 2. Abtlg. 1. Tl. *Manitius (Max)*. Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters. I. Tl. Von Justinian bis zur Mitte des 10. Jahrh. Mit Index. (xiii, 766 S.) 1911. 15; geb. in Halbfrz. n 17.50.

Harder (Christian). Schulwörterbuch zu Homers Illas u. Odyssee. 2. verb. Aufl. (xxiii, 281 S. m. 97 Abbildgn. u. 2 farb. Karten.) gr. 8°. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 4.

Hesiod's Werke, übers. v. J. H. Voss. Neu hrsg. durch Bertha Kern-v. Hartmann. (vii, 244 S.) 8°. Tübingen, *J. C. B. Mohr*, 1911. geb. in Pappbd. 3; in Halbperg. 4.50.

Horatius Flaccus, des Q., sämtliche Werke. 1. Tl. Oden u. Epoden. Erklärt v. C. W. Nauck. 17. Aufl. v. P. Hoppe. (xxvi, 227 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1910. 2.40; geb. in Leinw. 2.80.

Koch (Loth.) Xenophonsätze zur Einübung der griechischen Syntax in Tertia u. Secunda. 2. verb. Aufl. (vii, 93 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1910. 1.60.

Luciani quae fertur Demosthenis laudatio. Recensuit et illustravit Albers. (v, 76 S.) gr. 8°. Lipsiae, 1910. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 2.80; geb. 4.

Lukian's v. Samosata sämtliche Werke. Aus dem Griech. v. M. Weber. 1. Bd. (xv, 194 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *Verlag f. Literatur, Kunst u. Musik*, 1910. 8.

Münzen, die antiken, Nord-Griechenlands, unter Leitung von F. Imhoof-Blumer herausgegeben von der königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften. I. Bd. 2. Tl. Die antiken Münzen von Dacien und Moesien. Von B. Pick und Kurt Regling. II. Halbbd. 1 Abt. Die Münzen von Odessos und Tomis. Berlin, 1910. 8°. IV u. p. 519-920. Mit 1 Ergänzungstaf. S. 1906 Nr. 3391. 40 m.

Persii Flacci (A.) Saturarum liber. Iterum recensuit, adnotatione critica instruxit, testimonia usque ad saeculum XV addidit Santi Consoli. (xx, 190 S.) gr. 8°. Romae, *Loescher & Co.*, 1911. 4.

Petersen (Walt.) Greek diminutives in -*iov*. A study in semantics. (vii, 299 S.) gr. 8°. Weimar, *B. Wagner Sohn*, 1910. b 12.

Petronius' Satiren. Nach dem Text v. Frz. Bücheler verdeutscht durch e. homo Heidelbergensis. (160 S.) 8°. Heidelberg, *O. Petters*, 1910. b 7.50; geb. in Ldr. 10.

Platon. Auswahl: Protagoras (verkürzt), Laches, Menon u. Abschnitte aus dem Gorgias u. dem Euthydemos. Für den Schulgeb. hrsg. v. Herm. Röhl. 1. Tl. Text. (216 S.) 8°. Münster, *Aschendorff*, 1910. geb. 1.50.

— Protagoras. Für den Schulgebr. hrsg. v. A. Th. Christ. (107 S.) 8°. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1910. geb. 1.

Plutarch's ausgewählte Biographien. Für den Schulgebrauch bearb. v. Paul Verres. 1. Bdchn.: Demosthenes u. Cicero. II. Kommentar. (72 S.) kl. 8°. Münster, *Aschendorff*, 1910. 75.

Schirmer (Karl). Bilder aus dem altrömischen Leben. (viii, 148 S. m. 30 Abbildgn.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 2.50.

Schramm (E.) Griechisch-römische Geschütze. (37 S. m. Abbildgn. u. 10 farb. Taf.) gr. 8°. Metz, *G. Scriba*, 1910. geb. in Halbleinw. 8.

Schwahn (Wth.) Geschichte der Griechen und Römer im Altertum. Berlin, 1910. 8°. IV, 410 pp. Mit 20 Taf. 20 m.

Skerlo (H.) Ueber den Gebrauch von *ἐπί* bei Homer. (71 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock*, 1910. 2.

Sophokles, des, Tragödien. Deutsch v. H. Schnabel. 2 Bde. (v, 497 S. m. Bildnis.) 8°. Leipzig, *Dr. W. Klinkhardt*, 1910. je 8; in 1 Leinw. Bd. geb. 7.

Steele (R. B.) Conditional Statements in Livy. Leipzig, 1910. 8°. 61 pp. 2 m.

Stowasser (J. M.) Griechenlyrik. Römerlyrik. In deutsche Verse übertr. 4-8 Taus. 2 Bde. (xxiii, 287 u. xx, 492 S.) 8°. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1910. geb. 5.

Tragoedien, griechische. Übers. von Ulr. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. III. Bd. Euripides: Der Kyklop; Alkestis; Medea; Troerinnen. 3. Aufl. (368 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 6.

— dasselbe. Einzelausgaben. 1. Heft. Sophokles: Oedipus. 7. Aufl. (88 S.) 8°. Ebd., 1910. geb. in Leinw. 1.

Traube (L.) Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen. Herausg. von Fr. Boll. 2. Bd. Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters. Herausg. von P. Lehmann. München, 1910. 8°. IX, 176 pp. S. 1909 Nr. 285. 8 m.

Viedebantt (Osc.) Quaestiones Epiphanianae metrologicae et criticae. (x, 140 S. m. 6 Taf.) gr. 8°. Lipsiae, 1911. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 6.

Wohlrab (Mart.) Die altklassischen Realien im Gymnasium. 8. Aufl. (viii, 104 S. m. 2 farb. Plänen.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. geb. 1.20.

Zander (C.) Eurythmia vel compositio rhythmica prosae antiquae exposuit Z. I. Eurythmia Demosthenis. Leipzig, 1910. 8°. XX, 494 pp. 8 m.

ITALIAN.

Porzio (G.) Atene, Corinto, Pericle e le cause della guerra Peloponnesiaca. Bologna, 1910. 8°. L. 4.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Arrian's *Anabasis* in Auswahl von Georg Heldreich. I. Teil. Einleitung u. Text. II. Teil. Erklärende Anmerkungen u. Wörterbuch. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. 1 m. 75 pf.

'Αθηνᾶ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν 'Αθήναις 'Επιστημονικῆς 'Εταιρείας. Τόμος κβ', τεύχος γ' καὶ δ'. 'Αθήνησιν, 1910.

Barbagallo (Corrado). Lo Stato e l'Istruzione Pubblica nell' Impero Romano. Catania, *Francesco Battiano*, 1911.

Bennett (C. E.) *Syntax of Early Latin*. Vol. I. The Verb. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1911.

Berliner Texte. Herausg. von der Generalverwaltung der Kgl. Museen zu Berlin. Heft VI. Altchristliche Texte. Bearbeitet von C. Schmidt u. W. Schubart. Mit 2 Lichtdrucktafeln. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1910. 10 m.

Brown (F. C.) Elkanah Settle. His Life and Works. Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*, 1910. \$1.25.

Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin No. 37. Gerard Fowke: Antiquities of Central and Southern Missouri. No. 45. Frances Densmore: Chippea Music. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., *Government Printing Office*.

Butler (Isabel). Tales from the Old French. Boston, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*, 1910. \$1.25.

Ciceronis (M. T.) ad M. Brutum et M. Bruti ad M. Tullium Ciceronem Epistularum Liber Nonus. Recensuit H. Sjögren; Gotoburgi, *Eranos' Förlag*; Lipsiae, *O. Harrassowitz*, MDCCCX. 1 kr. 50 öre.

Collitz (Hermann). Zum Hildebrandslied. Separatabdruck aus: Paul, Sievers u. Braune's Beiträge XXXVI. Band. 2 Heft. Halle, *Niemeyer*, 1910.

— Review of Fick's Hattiden u. Danubier in Griechenland. Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vol. V, No. 4, October, 1910.

Classical Quarterly (The). October, 1910. London, *John Murray*, 1910.

Cook (Tennessee Claflin). The Need of Revising Morals and Laws. London, *Haymann, Christy & Lilly*.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Ed. consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis. Vol. XXXVI. Tyranni Rufini Opera. Pars. I. Orationum Gregorii Nazianzeni Novem Interpretatio. Edidit Augustus Engelbrecht. Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, MDCCCX. 12 m. 56 pf.

Eastern and Western Review. November, 1910, and January, 1911. *Greek-American Publishing Co.*, Boston, Mass.

Ellis (Robinson). *Adversaria VII*. *Journal of Philology*, Vol. XXXI.

— Note on De Deo Socratis. Note on the Fragments of Callimachus. III, p. 123.

Essays on Modern Theology and Related Subjects. A Testimonial to Charles Augustus Briggs on the completion of his seventieth year. New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1911. \$2.50.

Fiske (G. C.) Lucilius and Persius. Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XL, 1910.

Gildersleeve (B. L.) and Miller (C. W. E.) Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes. Second Part, Embracing the Doctrine of the Article, Elaborated by Professor Miller. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1911.

Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature. I. Santyana (George). Three Philosophical Poets, Lucretius, Dante and Goethe. Cambridge, *Harvard University*, 1910. \$2.25.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XXI, 1910. *Harvard University*, Cambridge, Mass.

Haupt (Paul). The Book of Micah. A New Metrical Translation with restoration of the Hebrew Text and Explanatory and Critical Notes. Reprinted from the American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1910.

Heidel (W. A.) The ἀναρμοὶ ὄγκοι of Heraclides and Asclepiades. Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XL, 1910.

Hempl (George). The Solving of an Ancient Riddle. The Phaestos Disk. Reprint from Harper's Magazine, January, 1911.

Hermes. Herausg. v. E. Leo u. Carl Robert. XLV. Band. 4. Heft. XLVI. Band. 1. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1911.

Hodge (Frederick Webb). Handbook of American Indians. North of Mexico. In two Parts. Part 2. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology.) Washington, D. C., *Government Printing Office*, 1910.

Humanistic Studies, The Value of. The Classics and the New Education. A Symposium from the Proceedings of the Classical Conference held at Ann Arbor, Michigan, March, 31, 1910. Reprinted from the School Review, September, October, November, 1910.

Lateinisches Lesebuch für Gymnasien von Karl Prinz. II. Teil. Erklärende Anmerkungen u. Wörterbuch. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. 1 m. 50 pf.

Lehmann-Haupt (C. E.) Die historische Semiramis u. ihre Zeit. Mit 50 Abbildungen. Tübingen, *J. C. B. Mohr*, 1910. geb. 2 m.

Magoun (H. W.) Aryan Root Vowels. Three-eight and Other Analyses of Logaoedic Forms.

— Extracts from the Proceedings of the American Philological Association, Vol. XL, 1910. The Glacial Epoch and the Noachian Deluge. Cambridge, Mass. *The Author*: Address c/o Kirtland Sons, 1910. 25 c.

Manitius (Max). Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters. Erster Teil. Von Justinian bis zur Mitte des zehnten Jahrhunderts. Mit Index. (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausg. v. I. von Müller. Neunter Band. 3 Abt. 1 Teil.) München, *C. H. Beck (Oscar Beck)*, 1911. 15 m.

Μελέτη ('H). Μηνιαῖον δημοσίευμα. 'Οκτ. Νοέμβ. Δεκ. 1910. ἐν 'Αθήναις. @ 1 δρ.

Merrill (Elmer Truesdell). On the Early Printed Editions of Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan. Classical Philology, Vol. V, No. 4, October, 1910.

Minucii (M. M. Felicis) Octavius. Con Introduzione e Commento di Luigi Valmaggli. Torino, *Paravia e Comp.*, 1910. L. 1.60.

Mustard (W. P.) On the Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus. Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XL, 1910.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. Bernhard Gerth.

Dreizehnter Jahrg., 1910. XXV. u. XXXVI. Bandes 10 Heft. Vierzehnter Jahrg. XXVII. u. XXXIII. Bandes 1 Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1910–1911.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Nr. 5/6. Nr. 7/8. Helsingfors, 1910.

Oriental Bibliography. Vol. XXII (for 1908). Third Part. Compiled and edited by Lucian Scherman. Berlin, *Routledge & Reinhard*, 1910. 12s. 6d. per ann.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). Ed. by Sir Jas. A. H. Murray. SIMPLIFIED, by W. A. Craigie. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*. 60 c.

Pascali (Carlo). Dioniso. Saggio sulla religione e la parodia religiosa in Aristofane. Biblioteca di Filologia Classica. Catania, *Franco Battiato*, 1911. L. 5.

Perron (Georges). Notice sur la vie et les travaux de Henri Weil. Institut de France. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Paris, *Ernest Leroux*, MDCCCXC.

Petersen (Walter). Greek Diminutives in ION. A Study in Semantics. Weimar, *R. Wagner Sohn*, 1910.

Platon's Protagoras von A. Th. Christ. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. 1 m.

Plutarch's Cimón and Pericles with the Funeral Oration of Pericles. Thuc. II, 35–46. Newly translated with Introduction and Notes. By Bernadotte Perrin. New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1910. \$2.00.

Prammer's Schulwörterbuch zu Caesars Bellum Gallicum. Bearbeitet von Anton Polaschek. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911.

Putori (N.) Lo Xiphias di Diego Vitrioli. Messina.

La Collezione di Vasi antichi del poeta Diego Vitrioli. Estratto da *Ausonia*, Anno IV, MCMIX. Fasc. II.

Reinhardt (Carolus). De Graecorum theologia Capita duo. Berolini, *Apud Weidmannos*, MCMX. 4 m.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Julio de 1910. Universidad de la Habana. Habana, *Avisador Comercial*, 1910.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von August Brinkmann. N. F. LXV. 4. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerländer's Verlag*, 1910.

Ridgeway (William). The Origin of Tragedy with special reference to the Greek Tragedies. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1910. \$2.25.

Robbins (F. E.) The relation between Codices B and F of Pliny's Letters. Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vol. V, No. 4, October, 1910.

Robinson (D. M.) A Panathenaic Amphora with the Archon's name Astelos.

— Greek and Latin Inscriptions at Sardis. *American Journal of Archaeology*, XIV, No. 4, 1910.

Rolfe (John C.) Verg. Aen. III 207 and Caesar, B. G. I, 18, 4–6. *Classical Journal*, Vol. VI, No. 2, November, 1910.

Samter (Ernst). Geburt, Hochzeit u. Tod. Beiträge zur vergleichenden Volkskunde. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 6 m.

Schickinger (H.) Auswahl aus Plutarch. 2. Teil. Erklärende Anmerkungen. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. 1 m. 50.

Schirmer (Karl). Bilder aus dem altrömischen Leben. Ein Lesebuch für die oberen Klassen höherer Lehranstalten. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1910. 2 m. 50 pf.

Schulz (Hans). *Deutsches Fremdwörterbuch. Erste Lieferung, A-Batterie.* Strassburg, *Karl J. Trübner*, 1910. 1 m. 50 pf.

Scriptor Latinus. Annus VIII. Num. VI-VII. Editor, Hans Lüsteröder; Redactor, Voldemarus Lommatzsch, Bremerhaven, 1911.

Shorey (Paul). A Symposium on the Value of Humanistic, particularly Classical Studies: The Classics and the New Education. III. The Case for the Classics. *School Review*, November, 1910.

— Φύσις, Μελέτη, Ἐπιστήμη. Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XL, 1910.

Snell (A. L.) *The Beginnings of Speech. A Treatise on the Uni-Radical Origin of Indo-European Words.* London, *Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.*, 1910.

Stewart (J. F.) and Tilley (Arthur). *The Romantic Movement in French Literature, Traced by a Series of Texts, Selected and Edited.* Cambridge, *At the University Press.* New York, *G. R. Putnam's Sons*, 1910. \$1.25.

Terenti (P. T. Afri). *Hauton Timorumenos.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by F. G. Ballentine. Boston and New York, *R. H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1910.

University of California Publications in Semitic Philology. Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 129-297, October, 1910: Contents—Abû'l-Mahâsim Ibn Tagbrî and Birdî's Annals. Edited by William Popper. Berkeley, California, 1910.

Valentino (Roberto). *Un Codice abbreviato di Valerio Massimo. Estratto dagli Studi italiani di Filologia Classica.* Vol. XVIII. Firenze, *R. Seeber*, 1910.

Vance (J. M.) *Beiträge zur Byzantinischen Kulturgeschichte am Ausgange des IV. Jahrh. Aus den Schriften des Johannes Chrysostomos* (Jena Diss.). Jena, *Neuehahn*, 1907.

Wied (Karl). *Praktisches Lehrbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache für den Schul- u. Selbstunterricht.* Vierte Aufl. Wien u. Leipzig, *A. Hartleben's Verlag*, 1910. 2 k. 20 h.

Whitmore (Charles E.) *On a Passage in Pindar's Fourth Nemean Ode.* Printed from the Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXI, 1910.

Xenophon's Anabasis Books I-IV. Edited with an Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by M. W. Mather and J. W. Hewitt. New York, *American Book Company*, 1910.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXII, 2.

WHOLE No. 126.

I.—HORATIAN URBANITY IN HESIOD'S WORKS AND DAYS.

Hesiod's Works and Days have served too long as a *corpus vile* for critical dissection. Such treatment cannot entirely kill the life of this sturdy old poet:

invenies eadem disiecti membra poetæ.

But why tear him into fragments? Stimulated by Eduard Meyer's recent article on Hesiod,¹ and heartily concurring in his general attitude of conservatism, I would go farther still in this direction and try to show that the poem as we have it is substantially a unit. There may of course be minor corruptions or interpolations in the text, but the argument here presented does not need, for the chief points at issue, to assume any interpolation, and it declines, with some vigor, an emended text.²

¹ Hesiods Erga und das Gedicht von den fünf Menschengeschlechtern, in Genethliakon Carl Robert . . . überreicht von der Graeca Halensis, Berlin, 1910, pp. 159-187. I arrived at the conclusions presented in this paper after reading Meyer's article and studying again the Works and Days. I have since examined some of the recent literature on Hesiod, and am interested in finding the unity of the poem maintained in the excellent dissertation of P. Waltz (Hésiode et son Poème Moral, Paris-Bordeaux, 1906) and in that of E. Lisco (Quaestiones Hesiodeae Crit. et Mythol., Gottingae, 1903, 48-62). On Waltz, see below, p. 158 ff. Lisco, following his master Leo, explodes Kirchhoff's theory, and gives a most careful analysis of the first half or so of the poem, showing how the parts are linked inextricably together. I am glad to find that he and Waltz have anticipated various of the details set forth below. The whole question is well treated by W. Fuss (Versuch einer Analyse von Hesiods Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι, Borna-Leipzig, 1910) who agrees essentially with Meyer; but see below, p. 148, n. 5.

² The number and age of the MSS of the Works and Days justify this initial assumption. The case of the Theogony is different. The complete

Taking our poem, then, as the manuscripts give it to us, we inquire first for what occasion it was written. Our answer must be derived solely from the text before us; we have no other evidence. Here, it seems to me, is the situation as the poem sets it forth.¹

Hesiod and Perses had received each a share of their father's estate. But Perses, not content, appropriated a considerable amount besides, with the connivance of the Boeotian princes who presided at trials. The epithet 'gift-devouring', applied to these judges, explains why they were ready to favour Perses.² Hesiod accepted what was left him and tilled his little patch with success, while Perses fared no better for his unrighteous triumph of the moment. After wasting his portion, he applied to his brother, with considerable effrontery, to help him out. But Hesiod refused.³ Perses, in revenge, brought suit against his

MSS of this poem are late and these all go back to one archetype in which various interpolations may have been made and which, as Rzach rightly denotes, lacked the end of the poem. The closing lines do not, I believe, give a transition to the Catalogue of Women, as is maintained, for instance, in Christ, *Griech. Litteraturgeschichte*, 1910, p. 113; they are parallel, word for word, with verses 965 f. There the poet tells of mortal men whom goddesses visited. With v. 1021 he goes on to tell, doubtless, of mortal women whom gods visited. We should probably find *δοσαι* the first word of 1023. The *Theogony* has sufficient unity in the part preserved; a very important element in it is the exaltation of Zeus and the reign of righteousness, intellectual order and spirituality.

¹ I hardly need say that I accept the statements in the poem as referring to actual history. See Croiset, *Hist. de la Litt. Grecque*, I, 472. Gilbert Murray, *Hist. of Greek Lit.*, p. 53, calls Perses a lay figure.

² V. 37: *ἤδη μὲν γὰρ κλῆρον ἔδασσάμεθ', ἄλλα τε πολλὰ | ἀρπάζων ἐφόρεις μέγα κυδαινῶν βασιλῆας | δωροφάγους*. The time distinctly antedates the period in which the poem was composed. The *ἤδη* with the aorist followed by the imperfect has, I take it, the face of a *cum inversum* construction in Latin; 'we had already received our shares, when you proceeded to take some more'. On this much of the passage I agree with Mair, *Hesiod . . . done into English prose*, 1908, p. xix.

³ V. 395: *ὥς καὶ νῦν ἐπ' ἐμ' ἦλθες· ἐγὼ δέ τοι οὐκ ἐπιδώσω | οὐδ' ἐπιμετρήσω*. 'Ἠλθες refers, of course, to a time previous to the writing of the poem, but as *νῦν* shows, not to so early a time as that designated by *ἔδασσάμεθα* and *ἐφόρεις* in v. 37. Since then, Perses has become a beggar. Besides the statement later in the poem (vv. 393-396), the implication is clearly made in vv. 30-34; see below, p. 134. We must therefore allow Perses some months at least in which to squander the property mentioned in vv. 37-38. The trial in question, then, cannot relate, as Mair thinks (*op. cit.*, p. xix), merely to the

brother; the case was to be tried before the same gift-devouring judges who had assisted him before.¹ Hesiod, urging his brother to settle the matter justly by private conference,² either sent to him, or read before an audience, all of the present poem, which he either then or later entitled 'Works and Days'.

Let us see if this account is not consistent with what the poem contains. If it can be proved that the work has essential unity, and was written for Perses before the trial, we must conclude that Horatian urbanity was an important element in Hesiod's temperament. The most of this paper must be devoted to an analysis of the poem, but only in this way may we approach our intended goal. On the other hand, a new estimate of the poet's character will help to establish the unity of the poem.

The poem opens with a solemn invocation (vv. 1-10) to the Muses and to the mighty Zeus, who can bring down the scornful from their seat and exalt the humble and meek. "Look on me and hear me", he cries, "and guide thou judgments justly; and to Perses³ I will speak a word of truth". These last words indicate the purpose of the poem. It begins on the plan of many an ancient work, as for instance the different books in Lucretius's *De Rerum Natura*; first comes some sort of invocation, here a prayer, and then the theme is announced. The appeal for a righteous judgment shows that the trial has not yet come off.⁴ The religious note sounded clearly in the opening lines will be heard at intervals throughout the poem.

original misappropriation of Perses. Just what Perses hoped to get from his brother by this second assault is nowhere stated. He may have had designs on all of Hesiod's part of the estate, or he may have claimed merely enough to pay his debts, to which the poet alludes in vv. 404 and 647. It was at any rate a critical situation for Hesiod, as the fable of the nightingale and the hawk implies (vv. 202-212).

¹ V. 39 (immediately after the quotation given above, p. 132, n. 2): οἱ τήνδε δίκην ἐθέλουσι δικάσσαι. The demonstrative τήνδε seems emphatic, and refers most naturally to the future. Mair well observes (op. cit., p. xx) of Schoemann's 'emendation' (ἐθέλοντι δικάσαν), which implies that the trial had already taken place, "an assumption at once more gratuitous and more at variance with the context can hardly be imagined". Just so Meyer, op. cit., p. 161, n. 2.

² V. 35: ἀλλ' αἴθε διακρινώμεθα νεῖκος | ἰθείησι δίκης, αἱ τ' ἐκ Διὸς εἰσιν ἀρισται.

³ Reading Πέρση rather than Πέρση, the evidence of the MSS being uncertain. See Meyer, op. cit., p. 160, n. 1.

⁴ Well shown by Meyer, *ibid.*

Hesiod's first message to his brother (11-42) is a somewhat leisurely exposition, in the manner of gnomic poetry, of the meaning of 'Strife' (*Ἔρις*). There are two kinds, evil strife, which involves men in wars and feuds, and good strife, which is the clue to wealth. For "she rouseth even the inefficient man (*ἀπάλαμον*) to work. For when he that lacks work, looks on another who has wealth, she asks him to plough and sow and to keep well his house" (20 ff.).¹ Working, farming, and duties domestic and social, will be treated later on, as we shall see, under separate heads. Thus far, though the reference to the inefficient man carries a thrust, Hesiod has not addressed Perses directly. Turning now to Perses, he exhorts him to cleave to the good and forsake the evil strife. "For small time has he for quarrel and dispute who has not stored within his house a year's supply of the seasonable fruits that the earth brings forth, Demeter's grain. Should you have full stock of that, you² could then stir quarrels and contentions for the goods of others. But for you 'twill not be possible to do the same a second time". Perses, that is, may have enough left to bribe the judges on the present occasion, or can make satisfactory promises, but with his extravagant tastes, his fund for corruption cannot last forever.³ Clearly, Perses is as poor at this moment, that is before the trial, as the latter part of the poem makes him out to be.⁴ Hesiod now appeals to him to settle the affair privately, as Zeus and justice shall direct. He reminds him, in words I have quoted before,⁵ that they both received a share of the property, but that Perses had added to his amount unjustly, with the help of the "gift-devouring princes who are anxious to adjudge the present case. Fools they are, and know not that the half is better than the whole, nor that there is great profit in mallow and asphodel."

It is a splendid and magnanimous spirit that speaks here. Hesiod has suffered injustice and is probably to suffer more, from

¹ In the citations which follow I do not always aim at a complete translation. A paraphrase often saves time as it is both translation and interpretation. But the reader should consult the text in each instance, to see if the paraphrase is true to it.

² Again, Schoemann's 'emendation' of *ὀφέλλους* to *ὀφέλλοι* in v. 33 is highly objectionable.

³ Just so, later on (vv. 401 ff.), Hesiod tells Perses that he may succeed twice or thrice at begging but not forever.

⁴ So Lisco, also, interprets vv. 30 ff. (op. cit., p. 49).

⁵ See above, p. 132, n. 2.

his own brother. In reply, he does not lay on the heavy flail of indignation, but invites the offender to reason the matter out with him. One weapon he has more effective than the flail; it is the sharp sword of urbane satire. Perses, the impoverished, the short-sighted, is made out more fool than knave, while the princes, who are plainly called fools, are treated not with an anathema but with a proverb, with an exhortation to Horatian contentment and the prescription of a familiar article of Horatian diet.¹ I detect in this introduction the more or less explicit mention of four main principles on which Hesiod is to base his appeal; Justice,² Work,³ Contentment⁴ and Religion.⁵

But before discoursing on these themes in detail, the poet inquires, in as leisurely a spirit as before why the gods have concealed the fruits of the earth (*βλῶς*) from man (43-212). So far from exploding in righteous invective, Hesiod is going into the philosophy of the matter. Had not the gods made agriculture so difficult, he declares, "you, by working for a day might easily have laid by enough for even an idle year. You might quickly have put up your rudder⁶ above the fire, and let the work of oxen and of patient mules go hang". But this glimpse of what Perses would doubtless consider a golden age must give place to the stern actuality of hard work. Zeus has begrudged mankind an easy livelihood because Prometheus cheated him. Zeus hid fire as well, but Prometheus stole it back. Hesiod had told the story of Prometheus before in his *Theogony*; he gives a somewhat shorter version here, repeating several lines and phrases from his earlier account.⁷ He draws the same moral

¹ Carm. 1, 31, 15: *me pascunt olivae | me cichorea levesque malvae.*

² V. 36: *ἰθείησι δίκης*, etc.

³ V. 20 f.: *ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐγείρειν*, etc.

⁴ V. 40 f.: *πλέον ἡμῶν παντός*, etc.

⁵ V. 36: *αἱ τ' ἐκ Διὸς εἰσιν ἀρισται*. Cf. also the invocation, vv. 1-10. Lisco, op. cit., p. 50, shows the connection between this passage and the invocation and adds: *his autem versibus [11-48] utrumque carminis argumentum quod ad Persen attinet significatur, scilicet: et iustitia et laboribus opus esse. quae differentia ad totius carminis structuram pertinet.*

⁶ Why rudder? The Boeotian farmer was sailor, too; later the poet will devote a special section to the art of sailing. Note the likeness of v. 45: *αἰψά κε πηδάλιον μὲν ὑπὲρ καπνοῦ καταθεῖο* to v. 629: *πηδάλιον δ' εὐεργὲς ὑπὲρ καπνοῦ κρεμάσασθαι*. Lisco, op. cit., p. 49, aptly remarks: *ergo hic iam (i. e., v. 45) utrumque carminis extremi argumentum significat, cum tempora et agriculturae et navigationis postea sit expositurus.*

⁷ See Meyer, op. cit., p. 166.

from the myth that Horace does in Odes I, 3: Prometheus by his disobedience to the divine will, brought upon mankind all woe, in the person of Pandora. For before, in the early days of earth, men lived without ills or hard toil or grievous diseases,¹ but Pandora let all these calamities out of the box, leaving only Hope within.²

¹ V. 91 f.: νόσφιν ἄτερ τε κακῶν καὶ ἄτερ χαλεποῖο πόνου | νόσων τ' ἀργαλέων. The qualifying adjectives are important. Hesiod would by no means exclude work altogether. See below, p. 137.

² Waltz (Revue des Études Grecques, 1910, p. 49 ff.) revives Lebègue's ingenious theory that ἐλπίς means 'foreknowledge' (*préscience*). He concludes (p. 57): "Loin que l'Elpis s'identifie avec l'Espérance, c'est justement en la retenant prisonnière que les dieux nous permettent encore d'espérer". True enough, but can 'Ελπίς mean 'foreknowledge'? The definitions of Plato (δόξαι μελλόντων, Legg. 644 C) and of Hesychius (προσδοκία) to which Waltz appeals, certainly do not contain this idea. I agree with Waltz and others who regard ἐλπίς as one of the evils imprisoned in the box; that Hesiod could tinge the word with a sinister meaning we see from v. 500, where it refers to the idle visions of Perses and his like. Now man still has ἐλπίς, as he has Pandora and all that goes with her, but his possession of Hope differs from his possession of all the other evils in that they are everywhere dispersed and revealed but the nature of Hope is concealed. So Meyer takes this part of the myth (op. cit., p. 163), though he apparently regards 'Ελπίς as a good. Hesiod's profound idea is not inconsistent with a belief in the ultimate triumph of justice, as we may see from the myth of the ages (v. the discussion of Hesiod's pessimism, below, p. 140 ff.), but he heartily detests any gambling with the future. Hope is an evil for the idle Perses, and that is the chief point for Hesiod at the moment. In telling the story of Pandora before, he was interested in drawing a different moral, namely the reason for feminine perversity (Theog. 590 ff.); 'Ελπίς and the box do not appear at all. The interpretation I have suggested here would include the fact that man has not foreknowledge, as part of the Prometheus story (Plato, Gorg. 523 D) shows, but it attains this result without distorting the meaning of ἐλπίς (Croiset, Jour. des Savants, 1909, 474, rightly calls Lebègue's interpretation forced). We must keep to this, and remember too that Hesiod had before him a tangle of myths which he used for his own moral purposes. While his own thinking is straight and clear, he was bound to commit some inconsistencies with tradition. The athetizing of v. 99: αἰγίοχου βουλῇσι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο is peculiarly senseless. Hesiod's personal theology is as grand and simple as that of Aeschylus and the prophets of the Old Testament; he must express it at every turn regardless of its relevancy to myth. He gets into almost ridiculous plights in telling the story of Zeus's deception by Prometheus (Theog. 550 ff.) and especially in attributing universal providence to the still embryonic Zeus (Theog. 465). But brackets and emendation will not help matters; the interpreter of Hesiod must get at his thought and distinguish it from tradition, not seek its explanation there. See Meyer's admirable remarks on this matter (p. 163).

There is no mention of Perses in this story ;¹ naturally, Hesiod has lifted the subject to a plane from which personalities are excluded. But now addressing Perses (106), though not calling him by name, he bids him give heed to another legend, which will show that gods and mortal men are sprung from the same stock.² He has another purpose also in this second story, the transition to which has been indicated by his brief description of the happy times before Pandora (90 ff.). Thinking of the present plight of humanity, Hesiod determines to set forth at greater length the reasons of its degeneracy ; but one idea will also be the kinship of gods and men.

The legend of the ages is not myth but parable. It has, like the story of Prometheus, a definitely pointed moral, and shows in many of its details the deliberate invention of the poet. Thus in the Golden Age (109-126), though life is easy and the earth bears fruits of itself, men till their fields with a will.³ Hesiod reads back a gospel of work into that primitive peace, not as Meyer says,⁴ because he is bound to think of man as a peasant, but rather because the gospel of work is a cardinal point in his philosophy. Indeed, by what right do we call Hesiod a peasant at all ? He is at least a cultivated peasant, master of an Aeschylean theology⁵ and of a highly artificial vocabulary, which I question if Boeotian peasants understood. In the present poem, he is to all appearances, a land-owner, a gentleman farmer. He ploughed, but so did a certain noble in early Roman history. He also wrote poetry, as Cincinnatus did not do. Milton was not a peasant, and yet he finds work in Paradise for our first

¹ Col. Mure, *A Critical Hist. of the Lang. and Lit. of Ancient Greece*, 1850, II 386, suspects a touch of immediate allegory in the description of the wise Prometheus and the thoughtless Epimetheus, "who considered not what Prometheus told to him" (v. 86).

² V. 108: *ὥς ὁμόθεν γεγάασι θεοὶ θνητοὶ τ' ἄνθρωποι* has been athetized by Lehrs and many others, including Waltz, but Mair would retain it, and Meyer defends it vigorously ; see below, p. 141. The views presented in this paper are not affected by either the acceptance or the rejection of the verse. I prefer to accept it, influenced by Meyer's arguments. May we not also find a *testimonium* in Macrobius, *Com. in Somn. Scip.* 1, 9, 6: *sed Hesiodus quoque diuinæ subolis adsertor priscos reges cum dis aliis enumerat (i. e., vv. 121 ff.)?*

³ V. 119: *ἡσυχοὶ ἔργ' ἐνέμουντο σὺν ἐσθλοῖσιν πολέεσσιν*. See Meyer's rendering (*op. cit.*, p. 178): "sie aber bestellten die Felder . . . willig (eifrig, *ἐθελήμοι* . . .) und in Ruhe (ohne Streit, *ἡσυχοὶ*) mit vielen Edlen zusammen".

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

⁵ See above, p. 136, n. 2.

parents; there are no weeds in the garden, but Eve reminds Adam on more than one occasion that there is plenty of pruning to do.

This insistence upon the industry of primeval man strikes me as Hesiod's contribution to the myth of the Golden Age. He admires the piety and simplicity of that happy time, and has no desire for unnecessary toil and pain. But he is far from sentimentalizing the past, indulging in the tired peasant's dream of perpetual holiday. To Hesiod, life without work would not be a Golden Age; and he would also like to bring Perses to the same way of thinking.¹

There is another lesson for Perses in the story of the Golden Age. After the men of that time had perished, they became by the will of Zeus, "good spirits upon earth, watchers of mortal men, who watch over judgements and unrighteous deeds; clad in mist they wander everywhere over the land, givers of wealth; this kingly privilege likewise they have".² Perses should note,

¹ Part of Gilbert Murray's description of Hesiod impresses me as almost caricature: "There is no swing in the verses; they seem to come from a tired, bent man at the end of the day's work—a man who loves the country life but would like it better if he had more food and less toil" (Hist. of Anc. Greek Lit., 1903, p. 11).

² Vv. 124-125 (= 254-255): οἱ ἄρα φυλάσσουσιν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα | ἡέρα ἐσ-
σάμενοι πάντη φοιτῶντες ἐπ' αἶαν are excluded by Rzach, Meyer (op. cit., p. 176)
and others. They are in the MSS, and the fact of repetition makes rather for
than against their genuineness; see below, p. 145. The only external proof
against them is that Plutarch (Moral. 361 B), Macrobius (Com. in Somn. Scip.
1, 9, 7) and Proclus (Com. in Hesiod., in Gaisford, Poet. Min. Graeci III 101 ff.)
do not notice the lines. But Plutarch and Macrobius, it seems to me, do not
need for their purpose to quote *in extenso*. Macrobius gives a metrical render-
ing into Latin from 122 to 126, but it is not exact; thus he has nothing for
ἐσθλοί (or ἀγνοί) or for ἐπιχθόνιοι, unless he is mistranslating that with
quondam homines which otherwise corresponds to nothing in these lines;
rather he is suggesting by this phrase the previous part of the description.
Proclus, I will grant, has a comment on v. 255, though none on 125; it may
be that the suspected lines were not in his MS of Hesiod. But one reason
why no notice should be taken of at least verse 124 of the οἱ clause is that its
meaning is virtually given in the preceding phrase φύλακες ἀνθρώπων. Those
words would mean, judging not only by v. 254, but by Theog. 735 (of the three
set to stand guard over the conquered Titans), not 'protectors' of men but
'keepers', 'watchers', 'inspectors'. If Proclus did not have the suspected
lines in his text, he read this meaning in φύλακες, as his comment δντας δὲ φύ-
λακας τοῦ βίου τῶν ἀνθρώπων, δαίμονας καλεῖ, παρὰ τὸ δαῖναι τὰ πάντα, ἢ μερίζειν τὰ
ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις shows. Proclus also refers to Plato (δαίμονας

then, that a cloud of unseen witnesses surrounds the court-room, and that these are ready to punish villainy or, what would also appeal to Perses, to dispense wealth to the virtuous.

The account of the Silver Age (127-142) likewise seems almost biographical. In those days, says the poet, a lad grew to be an hundred years before leaving his mother, still playing games, the foolish child, and then after starting out in life, survived but a short time, such was men's violent transgression of one another's rights (*ὑβρις*) and their sacrilegious neglect of the gods. So Zeus hid them under earth. Though divinities (*μάκαρες*), they are mortal,¹ and degraded in class; yet after all some homage is their due.² This part of the legend, too, is largely Hesiod's invention.³ I venture the guess that Perses had been tied too long to his mother's apron strings; at any rate he lacked independence of character. When a weakling of this sort has to shift for himself, the only method of self-support that he can invent is to grab, like a child, for the property of others. That course, if practised by all members of society, would be the ruin of society.

A new type of degeneracy is presented. The men of bronze (143-155) illustrate another vice not alien to Perses' character. They engage in general war and descend nameless to Hades. More hopeful is the 'race of heroes that now succeeds (156-

δὲ τοὺς ἐφορῶντας τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, ὡς καὶ Πλάτων φησὶν; in Laws 713 C, as Gaisford points out, Plato declares that Kronos, knowing that human kind cannot of itself prevent πάντα μὴ οὐχ ὑβρεῶς τε καὶ ἀδικίας μεστοῦσθαι created divinities (δαίμονες) as rulers of cities. See Stallbaum, who refers to our passage (v. 111). Whether or not, then, verses 124-125 are genuine, their essential meaning is in the preceding phrase and Meyer's conception of the function of these divinities is wrong. Free dispensers of wealth "ohne Zutun der Menschen" would not, I am sure, win the approval of the moral Hesiod, nor would he be anxious to call Perses' attention to them. These guardians, rather, punish injustice and reward thrift; that makes a better lesson. Verses 124-125 are retained by Paley and Mair. Waltz adopts the questionable compromise of retaining 124 and bracketing 125.

¹Peppmüller's *θυητοῖς* for *θυητοί* is another gratuitous emendation.

²Meyer (op. cit., p. 180) sees an inconsistency here in allowing any reward to these useless creatures. But something must be conceded to their lineage. Hesiod, it would seem, found this part in the tradition, and did his best with it.

³See Meyer, op. cit., pp. 174 and 177. Apparently Meyer believes that Hesiod invented the story of the Silver Age altogether. Such a view, it seems to me, goes too far.

173). They are warriors too, but more just and noble; the Islands of the Blessed are their portion forever.¹ However, this ray of hope makes the iniquity of the Iron Age seem all the blacker. "Would that I had been born", the poet exclaims, "not in this Fifth Age of man, but either before or after". This were a childish utterance, if it stood by itself: "Any time but the present for me; let me fly to evils that I know not of". But the words help us to understand the puzzling intrusion of the Age of Heroes in Hesiod's otherwise gloomy account of human history. He does not believe, after all, that man has sped without a swerve down the ringing grooves of degeneracy. There are ups and downs; perhaps the next generation may come upon better times. Hesiod's eye is fixed not so much on historical evolution as on human character here and now; he could say of his poem, as truly as Dante, *subiectum est homo*.² The Age of Gold shows us righteousness and prosperity in union. The Ages of Silver and Bronze illustrate the immediate results of certain moral imperfections, laziness and arrogance. It is hard to trace any *development* from one period to the next.³ One age ceases and then, as though some cataclysm had intervened, the gods "make" another; that is Hesiod's formula. He presents to us, not the progress, or regress, of the ages, but a series of tableaux; not acts in a drama but scenes in a miracle play. Ovid's legend,⁴ which does not thrill with moral purpose, is much more orderly and genetic. Hesiod comes to history with the Age of the Heroes, who fought at Thebes and Troy. Those were times with which he must reckon and which were better than his own. His own times were admittedly bad; and yet he declares, "for all that shall good be mixed with evil". After the fifth age, however, Zeus shall add yet another, for which there seems little hope. The poet arraigns this coming generation in ardent words that Amos might have written. All family ties shall be broken, wrong shall rule at large, while Reverence (*Aidṓs*) and Righteous Retribution (*Néμεσις*) shall leave the world

¹ Vv. 169-169^a are surely interpolations; see Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

² See Meyer, p. 180, for some excellent remarks.

³ I cannot see the reason for Meyer's statement (*op. cit.*, p. 175) that the Iron Age represents the degeneracy of the Bronze as the Silver does that of Gold. There is no discoverable connection between the Ages of Bronze and Iron; the latter connects directly with that of the Heroes.

⁴ Met. i, 89 ff.

once and for all. Clearly Hesiod cannot have meant seriously his wish to be born *after* the Fifth Age, unless he wished for certain woe. We must interpret both this utterance and his final prophecy in the spirit of the other parts of his profound legend. For, again, he proclaims not so much a revelation of historical events, as a warning against moral consequences.¹ There is still some good in the world, and still some hope.² If we centre our attention on the ethical purpose of Hesiod and less on the historical framework in which he has set it, the inconsistencies in his treatment will cease to trouble us.³ They are there, but they do not affect the poet's main intention. Further, if we look again for a moment at what Hesiod announced as the theme of his myth, "how gods and mortal men are sprung from the same stock" (108), it yields an obvious moral. Not only men but gods, as the legend of the Gold and Silver ages shows, have need of work for their well-being.⁴ A somewhat similar undertaking appears in Horace's fourth ode of Book III, where the value of the spirit of poetry, that higher intelligence which overcomes brute force, is proved first for the individual, then for the state, and then for the gods themselves. It is interesting that this last idea is illustrated by the battle between gods and giants, so that both scene and motive may have been suggested to Horace by Hesiod.⁵ Meyer shows,⁶ by reference to the Theogony, that a familiar aspect of the Golden Age was the dwelling together of gods and men. If a poet were to describe that happy time he would begin with some allusion to this feature of the tradition. Hesiod so begins, but his meaning is novel. He is no dreamer who covets a life of godlike leisure; he would set both gods and men about their tasks.

I have referred in the title of this paper to the Horatian

¹ Meyer (op. cit., p. 186) finds in 190 f. a clear reference to Perses and the trial.

² This statement I would prove rather by v. 179 than by the story of Pandora and *ἐλπίς*. See above, p. 136, n. 2.

³ On such inconsistencies, see above, p. 136, n. 2, and also Meyer, op. cit., p. 170, n. 1.

⁴ Hesiod also involves gods and men in the same condemnation if they transgress the decrees of the Fates (Theog. 217-220), and gods are punished by Zeus for perjury (ibid., 783 ff.).

⁵ Certainly the reign of Zeus as described by Hesiod is one of spiritual order and refined intelligence. See vv. 886 ff., and above, p. 131, n. 2.

⁶ Op. cit., p. 168 f.

urbanity of Hesiod, and lest any should query how near to urbanity we are in the closing lines of the myth of the ages, I may point out that Horace, too, could at the needful moment speak out loud and bold in the fashion of an Old Testament prophet. The conclusion of Ode 6 of Book III is so despairing, that certain critics have imagined that the splendid series of odes, of which it is a part, were not written on a single plan. Though their unity cries out for recognition from the use of the same metre for them all and from the fact that the opening strophe of the first ode falls ridiculously flat if it applies only to this ode and not to the series, the objection has been raised¹ that the pessimistic close of the last ode precludes any intention of unity.

Damnosa quid non imminuit dies?
Aetas parentum, peior avis, tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturos
Progeniem vitiosorem.

These lines are as dismal as anything in Hesiod; and the motive is precisely the same. Both poets intend not an historical forecast, but moral denunciation, in the hope that it may prove a spur to moral activity. The pessimism of the moment is sincere, but in neither case is it incompatible with a temperament essentially courageous and urbane.²

"And now I will tell a fable to the princes", declares the poet (202). Evidently the preceding fables must have been told to Perses. He has not been named in either of them for a long stretch of verses, but he is addressed at the beginning of the second myth (106), and the moral of both of them is pointed sharply at him. Hesiod's method is precisely the same in the following fable. He sets before the princes a picture of the gentle nightingale struggling in the talons of the greedy hawk. Without completing the simile, "even so you have your claws on

¹ E. g., Professor C. L. Smith, *The Odes and Epodes of Horace*, ed. 2, 1903, p. 190.

² Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 165, remarks: "so hat er den Pessimismus, so tief er in seinem Gefühlsleben wurzelt, dennoch überwunden oder wenigstens zurückgedrängt: das Leben ist schwer, aber der Mensch kann es doch bestehen und durch energische Arbeit zu innerem Gleichgewicht und zur Gottergebenheit gelangen". Croiset I, 455: "mais avec cela, incapable de découragement". Waltz, *op. cit.*, p. 95: "mais c'est là un pessimisme assez superficiel", and in his edition, p. 53, "malgré son perpétuel mécontentement, il croit à la bonté de la vie, au triomphe définitif de la justice".

me", he leaves them, as he had left Perses before, to draw the inference; and the innuendo is more forcible than a statement.¹ The words would have no meaning if written after the trial;² written before, they bespeak a mind master of itself and serenely disdainful of consequences.

We come now to a passage (213-285) so different in colouring from the preceding that as an excellent critic of Hesiod remarked,³ one would imagine himself in the presence of another poet. But it is the same Hesiod returning to the gnomic manner of the passage on Strife which preceded the fables. It now looks as if Perses were to have his *haec fabula docet* after all. "Oh, Perses", he cries, "give ear to justice (*δίκη*) and foster not insolent transgression" (*ὕβρις*). This is one of the burdens of the song of the ages, and justice is one of the four principles announced at the beginning of the poem. Hesiod develops it here in detail. The passage consists of maxims strung together somewhat loosely, yet having as much unity as a chapter in Proverbs which deals with a general theme. A closer glance, too, will show that the grouping is not so haphazard after all.

The poet begins then with an address to Perses; and now is the time, we should expect, for the vials of wrath. But Hesiod merely says: "Foster not insolent transgression. For transgression profits not a poor wight. It is a burden hard enough for a good man. Justice is better than transgression for those who follow it to the end; and the fool finds this out by experience". This, again, is the tranquil mood of the Horatian satirist which Hesiod showed at the start. Ridicule poured out placidly by one who keeps his temper may prove more scalding than irate denunciation. Meyer declares⁴ that Hesiod does not call his brother "foolish" (*μέγα νήπιε*) until the second part of the poem, written sometime later, when he could take the situation calmly. But by a not too subtle innuendo we can find the same meaning in the present lines, just as we have found it before.⁵

¹ See Lisco, op. cit., p. 52, for a similar treatment.

² Thus the attempted emendation of v. 39 is of no profit to those (e. g. Waltz) who put the whole poem after the trial.

³ T. Stickney, *Les Sentences dans la poésie grecque d'Homère à Euripide* 1903, p. 68.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 162, n. 1. Meyer is quite right in stating that the epithet "ist keineswegs boshaft, sondern gutmütig".

⁵ See above, p. 135.

Sometimes it is quite as effective to call one a fool in the third person. At any rate, it is quite as urbane.

There follows a passage of deep feeling in praise of justice. Justice maltreated by "gift-devouring men who deal crooked judgements brings them doom,"¹ but to those who use her fairly, she sends peace and plenty". In fact a kind of Golden Age returns (225-237); "earth and woodland teem with their fruits, bees and sheep thrive lustily, wives bear children of like sort, men go no more to sea, but with good cheer tend the works that are their care". This last phrase:²

θαλίης δὲ μεμηλότα ἔργα νέμονται

takes me back to the men of the Golden Age,

οἱ δ' ἐθελημοὶ

ἡσυχοὶ ἔργ' ἐνέμοντο (v. 119)

and tells us again what that parable is about. As once the world lost its life of ease because it neglected work and fostered violence, so now the return is open for the peaceable and industrious. Virgil, too, in his Messianic eclogue declared that the Golden Age could be reproduced on this earth, and Horace caught up the strain in his somewhat belated tribute to Augustus

*quo nihil maius meliusve terris
fata donavere bonique divi
nec dabunt, quamvis redeant in aurum
tempora priscum.*³

In fact, in a similar description elsewhere, Horace may have had these very lines of Hesiod in mind.⁴

To reinforce his meaning, the poet now points to the opposite consequence; the promise of a Golden Age for those who do well is balanced clause by clause,⁵ but not too artificially, with a prophecy of evil for transgressors (238-247). There is careful art in this gnomic miscellany.

¹ Vv. 219-224, and cf. also the end of this passage, vv. 238-247.

² I adopt Mair's interpretation of *θαλίης*, which I think is borne out by *ἐθελημοὶ* and *ἡσυχοὶ* in vv. 118-119. See above, p. 137, n. 3.

³ Carm. 4, 2, 37 ff.

⁴ Cf. 4, 5, 33: *laudantur simili prole puerperae*, and *Works and Days*, 235: *τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες ἐοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσιν*, though of course coincidence in a common place like this may not be significant.

⁵ Contrast 227-228 with 242-243; 235 with 244; 236-237 with 247.

The exhortation to Perses is followed by one to the princes (248-274) just as in the preceding section they had been given a fable after the two that he had addressed to Perses. He warns them too to cleave to justice, for their actions are watched. "For there are upon the earth thrice ten thousand immortals of Zeus watchers of mortal men, who watch over judgements and unrighteous deeds; clad in mist they wander everywhere about the land" (253-255). These divinities, as the description shows, are simply those blest inhabitants of the Golden Age who died into immortality and became the guardian spirits of mankind. The solemn repetition of the very words used before adds force to the warning.¹ Thus this passage on justice is bound closely with the fables. Besides these watchful deities, the poet continues, there is the virgin Justice, who sitteth at her Father's hand, ever ready to take vengeance upon princes who wrest right judgements into false. Aye, that man plans evil for himself who plans it for another, for above all and seeing all is the awful eye of Zeus, which looks down even into our city and the manner of its justice (267-269):²

πάντα ἰδὼν Διὸς ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ πάντα νοήσας
καὶ νῦν τάδ', αἱ κ' ἐθέλῃσ', ἐπιδέρεται, οὐδέ ἐ λήθει,
οἶπν δὴ καὶ τήνδε δίκην πόλις ἐντὸς ἔργει.

It is tempting to think that Boethius had these verses in mind when he wrote the splendid words which end his *Consolation of Philosophy*:

"Magna vobis est, si dissimulare non vultis, necessitas indicta probitatis, cum ante oculos agitis iudicis cuncta cernentis".

At any rate Boethius might well have found in Hesiod an *anima naturaliter Christiana*.³

The exhortation to the princes ends characteristically: "May neither I nor my son be righteous among men, for it is idle to be

¹ See above, p. 138, n. 2. Virgil has the same effect in *Aen.* I, 530-533, where Ilioneus repeats what the reader later discovers are the very words of the oracle of Apollo (3, 163-166): *est locus, Hesperiam Graii cognomine dicunt*, etc.

² Or could τήνδε δίκην as in v. 39 refer specifically to the trial?

³ V. 267 in Hesiod suggests Homer's verse on the sun (*μ* 323, cf. *Γ* 227): *ὅς πάντ' ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούει* which Boethius too applied for a theological purpose, *V m.* 2 init. Col. Mure, *op. cit.*, II 398 observes of Hesiod's maxims: "Some embody almost word for word fundamental dogmas of the Christian moral code".

a righteous man, if the unrighteous shall have the greater right of might". Here speaks the gloomy prophet of the fable. But he adds at once :

ἀλλὰ τὰ γ' οὐ πω ἔολπα τελεῖν Δία μητιόεντα.

The sudden change in sentiment is quite in the spirit of Isaiah.¹

"Therefore the Lord shall have no joy in their young men, neither shall he have compassion on their fatherless and widows. For every one is an hypocrite and an evil doer, and every mouth speaketh folly. For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still".

With a final apostrophe to Perses, the passage on Justice comes to an end. "Beasts have not justice, but man is just. He who breaks his oath is visited with the vengeance of Zeus, but the generation of that man who abides by his oath is better in time to come".

Just here Meyer draws the dividing line between the earlier and the later poem. Even granting the correctness of this hypothesis, I find enough in the part already analyzed to justify the title of this paper. Hesiod has the moral sublimity of a Hebrew prophet. He feels deeply the evils of his times and denounces them with apocalyptic exaggeration; and so does Horace. But Hesiod's method of rebuking his brother is not to denounce him; it is rather to point out the folly of wrongdoing and shame him by ridicule. The princes, not unnaturally, he does denounce, and yet can treat them, too, with the milder derision:

"Fools, that know not that the half is better than the whole".

Part of the poem thus far is gnomic in character, consisting of moral exhortation, part is leisurely, philosophic reflection on man's development, or, rather, the consequences of his moral acts. If Hesiod could have written a work like this while the sentence of the court was impending, he could have added all the rest that we find in our text. Analysis will show that only a fragment of his idea is carried out in the part already examined.

Let us turn to the rest of the poem. It opens with a gnomic passage (286-382) which is distinct from the preceding² but does

¹ 9, 17.

² This fact is not observed by Mair in his translation, p. 11. The paragraphing in this otherwise admirable translation might be considerably improved.

not specially suggest the beginning of a new poem. "But I will speak to you with good intent, foolish Perses. Vice is easy and virtue hard; the gods have put sweat in front of it. But though the start is rough, the path is easy at the end. Give ear and I will tell you why. Worst of all men is he who will not follow advice. So first, the gods requite the industrious man and punish the sluggard. Work, then, Perses, scion of the gods" (298-309). For Perses, though senseless, is also, as the fable showed, sprung from the gods. The stock epithet may be intended as a rebuke to him for neglecting his birthright. "Men,¹ too", the poet continues, "as well as gods, will favour the industrious person who gains wealth, for the poor they hate. For work is no reproach, but idleness is shame (310-319). Get not your wealth by plunder", as Perses had done when the inheritance was divided,² "for such crime will class you with one who harms a suppliant, or seduces his brother's wife, or sins against the orphan and the aged. Zeus will requite all such (320-334). But rather pay your vows and offerings to the gods, that they may favor you, and that you may purchase another's inheritance and not he yours" (334-341). The allusion here seems pointed. "Keep on good terms with your neighbors. Entertain not your enemies, but do no harm to a friend. Let your dealings be just; gain naught unrighteously. Give to him that gives; give not to him that gives not". Perses must have found a certain sting in this golden rule; 'do unto others as I have just done to you'. "A gift is good, robbery³ is evil and dispenses death", that is, to the robber. "Who gives willingly, though he give much, feels joy. Who takes unjustly, though ever so little, is chilled at heart (342-360). Lay by, then, bit by bit, and soon you will have good store. When the cask is broached and when it fails, take your fill, but be sparing in the middle; 'tis niggardly to spare the less" (361-369). Here is much wisdom for the penny-wise and pound-foolish. "Pay your friend his promised reward, and smiling, set a witness even on your brother". Do not trust

¹ There can be no doubt as to the correct reading in vv. 309-310. Two classes of MSS, ψ and ϕ , and one MS, G, of class Ω have, correctly, *ἐργαζόμενος πολὺ φίλτερος ἀθανάτοισιν*, which connects at once with *ἔσσειαι* in the following line. *Ἐργαζόμενοι . . . φίλτεροι* is an easy error, in MSS C F H. Rzach's text is curiously and wonderfully made in certain places.

² *Ἀρπακτά* in v. 320 suggests *ἀρπάζων*, v. 38.

³ *Ἀρπαξ*, cf. n. 2.

indiscriminately, that is. This smile, suggesting at once a "playful adherence to a useless form"¹ and a recognition of the inevitableness of human frailty, is peculiarly the sign of a wise, Horatian temperament.² "Trust not the harlot woman,³ for women are deceivers. Have a son or more to tend your estate. If there are more, employment is the more, and more the increase. If then your heart is set on wealth, so do; and work you work upon work" (370-382).

I have not done justice in the above paraphrase to the gnostic character of this section. It consists of proverbs, some longer, some shorter, that sing off easily like the adages in pastoral amoebaeon.⁴ But though the elements are in form disjointed, the whole is given unity by the central idea, which is announced at the beginning and summed up vigorously in the closing lines. The theme of this part of the poem is Work; we have here a companion piece to the preceding section on Justice. Here as there, ideas kindred to the main theme are grouped coherently enough, though not with the preciseness of a lawyer's brief. Work is the main theme, while piety, economy and the skilful handling of one's neighbors and one's household are appropriately associated with it. The tone differs slightly, but not essentially, from that in the passage on Justice. In that there is more earnestness, in this, a touch more playfulness; the reason lies in the different nature of the themes. Now Work, as we have seen, was one of the four main principles suggested at the beginning of the poem, Justice, Contentment and Religion being the other three. The conclusion is to me unavoidable that the passage on Work, no less than that on Justice, belongs with the poem as its author originally planned it. We cannot, then, with Meyer, mark off Part I with verse 285.⁵

The little discourse on Work is most closely connected with

¹ Paley, ad loc.

² Cf. the beginning of Sat. 2. 5 for a similar situation.

³ Mair's 'scarlet woman' comes as near as anything in English can to *πυγροστόλος*.

⁴ Lines like 557-558: *μείς γὰρ χαλεπώτατος οὗτος | χειμέριος, χαλεπὸς προβά- τοις, χαλεπὸς δ' ἄνθρωποις* would fit well in pastoral. Perhaps further study should be made of the gnostic element in the pastoral; if so, the subject should be approached in the spirit of that brilliant work of Dr. Stickney's cited above (p. 143, n. 3).

⁵ Fuss (op. cit., p. 63), though agreeing with Meyer that the work falls into two separate poems, would have the first end with v. 335.

the following passage. In fact the last sentence, just quoted, serves, in a way, both as finale and as introduction.¹ The concluding injunction to "work work upon work" is now made specific. The poet passes in review the chief labours that engage the farmer (383-617). This is the part of the poem which is most intimately associated with Virgil's poem and which has most contributed to the opinion, held by some critics, that the *Works and Days* is essentially a didactic poem of the georgic sort.² But these precepts are incidental. They are involved in the larger theme, "Manage your estate thriftily and you will get wealth". Further, it is not only the Gospel of Work in general, but the Gospel of Work for Perses;

ἐργάζεο, νήπιε Πέρση (397).

Hesiod's art of farming, then, is not purely didactic or technical, but didactic, gnomic and personal at one and the same time. Now as it is impossible to dissociate this part, as I believe Meyer would agree, from the passage on Work, and as that is bound up with what preceded, the end of 'Part I' is not yet in sight. Certainly nothing in the following words indicates the beginning of a new poem.

"Start reaping when the Pleiades rise, and ploughing when they set. Let this be the law for farmers wherever their land may lie, far from the shore or near it. Wear no cloak when you sow, or plough, or reap." That is, I take it, get in a condition to work with all your might.³ "Else you will have to beg of other men, even as now you came to me."⁴ But I will not give to you or dispense to you. Work, foolish Perses, the works that the gods have assigned to men if you would pay your debts and keep starvation from the door. Begging may succeed twice or thrice, but not forever (383-404).

"Now first get a house and a wife and a plough ox. Do not put off till the morrow, for procrastination, as surely as idleness, leads to ruin" (405-413).

¹ But it should not head a new paragraph, as Mair has it, p. 14. 'Ὡδ' ἐρδεν surely refers to the preceding, as it does in v. 760. See below, p. 154.

² E. g., Gilbert Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

³ There is also of course in *γυμνὸν σπείρειν* the implication that these are employments of spring and summer when light clothing is needful. Later on (536-546), he describes the right clothing for winter.

⁴ See above, p. 132, n. 3.

"In autumn time, cut timber in the woods, and make your farming implements, especially the plough". Here the instructions are rather minute.

"Get you strong oxen and a steady hired man who can make his dinner of a loaf of four quarters and eight mouthfuls". Thus there is a certain liturgical promptness in his method of dispatching his food; he wastes no time at meals. "Let him be a quadragenarian, and hence not too fond of society" (414-447).

"The first cry of the crane is the sign for plowing to begin. If you have your oxen and plough all ready, you can begin. See that you have them. Try not to borrow, for you will be refused, nor think, like the man whose wealth is in imagining,¹ that you can make your plough then; for a plough is not made over night. So have it ready, and then to work with you, you and all your men. With a prayer to Zeus Chthonios and to Demeter, duly begin the ploughing, with a small boy to sow behind you and make trouble for the birds by hiding well the seeds. For order is the first law of the farm. Obey it and, Zeus willing, you can garner full sheaves and get the cob-webs out of your grain-vessels. Thus you will not look to others, but others will look to you (448-478).

"Plough at the solstice and you will reap sitting, holding but a little in your hand, dust-covered, not over rejoiced; you will carry your crop in a basket and few will look on in admiration. If late your sowing, wait till the cuckoo calls, and a good rain comes (479-492).

"Do not join the loungers at the blacksmiths on some wintry day when cold prevents men from work. See that you make provision for the wintry day and do not live on idle hopes like the lazy man, who lacking sustenance lays by in his heart a store of ills". Such then would be the result of Perses' latest stroke of high finance.

"Hopeful imagination² is not good for a needy man, sitting with the loungers and having naught at home. Be fore-armed. Even in midsummer have your granaries in readiness" (493-503).

"But shun the month Lenaion when Boreas blows in the icy

¹ This is Mair's rendering of *ἀνὴρ φρένας ἀφνειός* (455).

² On *ἐλπίς*, see above, p. 136, n. 2. Waltz (*Rev. des Études Grecques*, op. cit., p. 52) takes *ἐλπίς ἀγαθή* together and *οὐκ* as modifying the verb. This would certainly be an unnatural construction, and is rightly rejected by Masqueray, *Rev. Crit.*, 1910, II 130.

woods and wild beasts shiver and put tails between legs; for he bloweth through the thickest of fur and sets the old man upon the run.¹ But he cannot blow through the sheep in the fold or the tender maiden sitting by her mother in the cheerful house on a day when the Boneless One (the cuttle-fish) gnaws his own foot in his fireless home, and the creatures of the woods look like a three-legged old man with a broken back, as they lope about in the snow" (504-535). This picture of the horrors of the cold should serve to scare Perses into activity while yet it is time.

"In winter wear the kind of clothes I tell you, a soft cloak and full-length frock, so that the hairs on your shivering body will not stand on end. Wear comfortable oxhide sandals lined with felt. Make you a rain-coat of goatskin and a cap for your head, so that your ears will not get wet; for dawn is cold when Boreas blows. So anticipate the storm, get your work done first and back to the house before you are soaked through. Winter is an unlovely time. Then should cattle get half-rations and men an extra supply. For the friendly nights are long" (536-563). I imagine that Perses did not need this elaborate description of comfortable clothing or of the effects of a cold storm upon the body; more unpleasant still must have been the gentle shower of ridicule that Hesiod pours on him in this passage. The formally didactic *ὡς σε κελεύω* and the parody of Homeric phrases add to the bitterness.²

"When Arcturus and the swallow usher in the spring, trim your vines (564-570). But when the House-carrier (snail) crawls on the vines to escape the shower of the Pleiades, sharpen your sickles for the harvest and keep your servants busy. In reaping time, hug not your bed at dawn. For dawn, dawn is the time to work if you would lay by a goodly store" (570-581). Perses evidently got up at some other time.

"In the hot midsummer, when work goes hard, that is the time for a little recreation in the shade of a rock with a bit to eat and drink, and a zephyr blowing in your face. Three parts spring-water and one part wine will make good beverage" (582-596). Again, this is advice that Perses did not need.

¹ Rather than 'bent', 'stooping'? So the alternative explanation in Proclus: *ἡ ὀξὺν ἐν τῷ δρόμῳ*.

² V. 536 *ἔρπυμα χροός* (Δ 137), and v. 537 *τερμιόεντα χιτῶνα* (τ 242) are Homeric phrases. Paley, ad loc., "suspects" that the passage is "the work of an Ionic rhapsode". To a certain type of mind, humour always is suspicious.

"Comes threshing-time. Set your men at work, measure and store your grain. Then get a good head-man and a woman servant without a child. Treat well your sharp-toothed dog, lest the Day-Sleeper (that is, the Night-Prowler) steal your goods" (597-608).

"When Orion and Sirius have come into mid-heaven, then Perses, gather your grapes, and at the setting of the Pleiades, plow again" (609-617).

This completes the annual cycle indicated at the beginning of these instructions (383): "Start reaping when the Pleiades rise, and ploughing when they set". Just so the beginning and the end of the passage on Work (297-382) are bound together by the repetition of the main idea in the last line. The subject is treated with a fair amount of system, as befits a calendar. That part of the farmer's almanac is included which describes the tasks of the year in the order of occurrence. The information given by no means covers everything that the farmer needs to know; the object of the poet is by presenting both agreeable and disagreeable consequences to induce Perses to work. Perses is mentioned at the beginning of the passage and at the end, with an intervening stretch of over two hundred lines.

But the Boeotian farmer must know something about sailing, as Hesiod has already twice implied.¹ There follows a brief treatment of this art (618-694). "At the setting of the Pleiades tempt not the sea, but proceed to work your soil as I instruct you. Beach your boat, carry the tackling home and hang up your rudder above the smoke. Wait for good weather and then start out with a cargo and make money on it, as our father used to do, you foolish Perses. For he came all the way here from Cyme in Aeolis, fleeing penury, and got him a habitation in the miserable little town of Ascra (618-640).²

"So Perses, mind all works in their season, and especially sailing. Commend a little boat and put your cargo in a big one". Perses' neighbour might be induced by such commendation to put his wares in a little boat and hence take less to market. (641-645).

"If then you will turn your senseless soul to trade and desire

¹ Vv. 45, 388. See above, p. 135, n. 6.

² Waltz well remarks (in his dissertation, p. 134): "un simple tour de phrase donne parfois à un vers une naïveté pleine de malice". The meaning of 637 ff. is: "il ne faisait pas comme toi".

thus to escape your debts and cheerless hunger, I will show you the measures of the sounding sea—not that I am wise in the lore of sailing or of ships. The only voyage I ever made was to Aulis in Euboea and thence to Chalcis, where at the games of Amphidamas I won a prize for my hymn, a tripod that I offered to the Muses of Helicon, where they first set me on the path of song. I know no more of ships than that, but Zeus and the Muses will tell me how to sing of them” (646–662). What grounds had Plutarch¹ for objecting to this passage? I hope it is genuine; if so, we have a clear enough picture of how Hesiod spent his time. By profession he was a minstrel. He also owned a little farm. He wrote good poetry and managed his farm successfully. He stayed at home writing and ploughing, unless some contest summoned him to compete. This seems a simple and pleasant sort of existence which Horace would have liked.

“The summer months are the time for sailing. You will not suffer shipwreck then, unless Zeus and Poseidon be determined to destroy you. Avoid the late autumn, and wait in the spring till on the topmost branches of the fig-tree leaves appear in shape like the tracks of a crow. I fancy not spring sailing, for it must be snatched”. The epithet *ἀρπακτός* applied to this dangerous art, makes it almost a form of thieving or gambling; and Hesiod does not approve high finance. “Put not all your substance aboard, for ’tis terrible to run the risk of ruin in the waves. Observe due proportion: the fitting time is always the best” (663–698). This is all of the passage on sailing. The revelation of the Muses has not been very specific.

The poem can hardly end here. The part that follows (695–764) is distinct and yet no definite subject is announced, as has been the case in all the main passages examined thus far. We find a miscellaneous array of maxims on man’s social and religious conduct. The poet begins with marriage. There has already been mention of a wife, together with a good plough-ox and other necessities of the farm (405 ff.), but now her qualities are described. “When you are not much under thirty and are not much over, marry a maiden still in her teens. Let her be a neighbor’s daughter, and discreet. For there is nothing better

¹As reported by Proclus. See Rzach (ed. Maior), *ad loc.* Waltz, edition, p. 11, seems inclined to accept the passage.

than a good wife and nothing worse than a bad one, who without a firebrand can singe a man (695-795). In making friends, do not go too far. Do not make a brother of your friend. If you do, then be not the first to give offence. If he offends you, give him twice as good as he sends, but if he wishes to make up a quarrel, forgive him". Other maxims on friendship follow, and then comes a series of religious injunctions and taboos. "Wash the hands before pouring libations and before crossing a stream. Do not put the ladle across the mixing bowl; for that is attended by a grievous fate. Nor when building a house leave it unplanned, lest the croaking raven sit on it and croak. If you chance upon burnt offerings mock not these mysteries; God is angry too at this". These specimens will suffice; the religious character of the precepts is apparent. The series ends with a line or two on Rumour, which one may avoid by doing as above prescribed. "For one must pay heed to Rumour; for Rumour is in a way divine".

Those who believe this passage a later addition point out, besides its miscellaneous character, the fact that the name of Perses nowhere appears either here or in the rest of the poem. But it had appeared in the preceding part on sailing, and, as we have seen, there is no clear line between these two parts. In fact we must consider more carefully what Hesiod meant by the special works which follow and illustrate his discourse on Work in general (286-382). His aim, as we found, is not solely to discuss agricultural and nautical operations, but by selecting typical tasks to point the morals of industry, economy and social common sense. *Ἔργα*, therefore, as especially the latter part of the passage on work indicates (342-382) means 'deeds', 'principles of conduct' as well as 'works'.¹ The last line of the passage is a good summary of both these meanings; *ἔδ' ἔρδειν* (i. e. the proper 'deeds') *καὶ ἔργον ἐπ' ἔργῳ ἐργάζεσθαι* (i. e. 'works'). The detailed account of 'works' we have in the following passages on Farming and Sailing. 'Deeds' are treated incidentally there, but more particularly in the concluding passages. At the end of the present passage the poet harks back to the appropriate phrase *ἔδ' ἔρδειν* (760). The failure to mention Perses becomes less significant when we appreciate how closely the

¹ So, too, in Theog. 902 f.; *Εὐνομίην τε Δίκην τε καὶ Εἰρήνην τε θαλυῖαν | αἱ ἔργ' ὠρεῖν οἱ καταθητοῖσι βροτοῖσι*. The verb has a religious tinge in Theog. 416 f.; *ὅτε πού τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων | ἔρδων ἱερὰ καλὰ κατὰ νόμον ἱλάσκηται*.

passages on Work, Farming, Sailing and Social and Religious Conduct are bound together. Within the larger unity of the poem they form a group of over 450 verses; of these the passage on Conduct has but seventy. It should also be noticed that the religious precepts illustrate one of the four principles suggested at the beginning. Various pious utterances have appeared before, but here is a definite collection of maxims devoted to religion. Finally, as regards the miscellaneous character of this and other collections in the poem, it is worth noting that Virgil, who was something of an artist, took no offence at it, for he imitates the effect in two passages in his *Georgics*.¹

The last of the main sections of the poem is that on Days (765-825). The keynote is set in the opening line. "The Days that come from Zeus keep well, and duly tell them to your servants". The precepts are religious, like those in the latter half of the preceding section.² These prescribe what deeds should or should not be done; these tell when certain deeds are best done. If the preceding passage be admitted as part of the original poem, it is hard to rule this out. Taken together, they illustrate the idea of religious duty, the necessity of which was strongly emphasized at the beginning of the poem. The passage on Farming has something of the chronological nature of the present part, for it considers works in the order of the calendar. But here the treatment is more minute; each day of the month is lucky or unlucky for some special thing. Thus Hesiod gave instructions before about the general time for sowing, but now adds that the thirteenth day of the month is a bad day to begin the sowing, though excellent for setting out plants. To quote a few more specimens. "The eleventh and the twelfth are good for shearing sheep, the sixth is a kindly time for building a pen, the fourth for taking a wife to your home; and few know that the twenty-seventh is the time for broaching a jar and yoking up your beasts of burden and launching your boat". I cannot review these superstitions in detail, but they appear to be part and parcel of the farmer's life, altogether as important as an

¹ 1, 176-203; 2, 298-314. Book I of the *Georgics* is modelled with the utmost deliberation on Hesiod. Virgil at once pays homage and offers challenge to his master and ultimately transcends him. See below, p. 165, n. 1.

² See Mair, pp. 104 ff., 110 ff., 162 ff., and Waltz (dissertation), pp. 69 ff.; (edition) pp. 19 ff.

intimate acquaintance with the parts of a plough. Agriculture was still the handmaid of theology; only a theologian could really plough. If Hesiod set about to give his brother, I will not say complete, but even sufficient instruction in the art of successfully managing a farm, he could not, with his deeply religious temperament, omit these precepts. Though Perses is not named, this section connects closely with the preceding, and that with the part before.

Considering everything after verse 285, we can well see why Meyer regards this part as a complete poem written for a definite occasion. No more appropriate title could be devised for it than *Works and Days*. It falls into the following five parts: General Precepts on Industry and Economy, Precepts on Farming, on Sailing, Social and Religious Precepts, Days. I cannot conceive that the scheme would be complete with any one of those gone. But beginning with the other end of the poem, we have seen¹ that it is impossible not to include the passage on Work with that. The natural conclusion is that both parts form one poem of definite scope and purpose. The main principles on which the poet bases his appeal are stated at the beginning, and all but one are elaborated in special sections. The one principle not thus treated, Contentment, is incidentally involved in all the others. Another subject, Social Duties, is only vaguely suggested at the beginning,² but receives occasional treatment in various of the main passages and occupies part of the passage preceding that on Days. It develops naturally out of the passage on Work, with its specific illustrations, for *ἔργα* means not only Tasks, but Deeds or Principles. As in all artistic creation, the poem avoids at once loose irrelevancy in construction and a too mathematical rigidity. The plan is completed by an admirable summary³ in just three lines at the end:

"So a man becomes happy and wealthy who knowing all these things works, blameless in the sight of the immortals, minding their omens, and eschewing transgressions".⁴

¹ Above, pp. 148 ff.

² Vv. 20 ff. See above, p. 134.

³ So Waltz (edition), p. 14. He states (*ibid.*, p. 16) the "quatre questions" as "justice, travail, piété, relations sociales".

⁴ Vv. 826-828: *τάων εὐδαιμόνων τε καὶ δλβιος, δς τάδε πάντα | εἰδὼς ἐργάζεται ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν, | δρνιθας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλκείνων.* *Εὐδαιμόνων* suggests Contentment; *δς τάδε πάντα εἰδὼς ἐργάζεται* Works (and Deeds); *ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν* both Justice and Religion; *δρνιθας* Religion again, and especially the

This is the life of a man who steers his course by Contentment, Work, Justice and Religion. These verses bind beginning, middle and end into one consistent whole. There is roughness at the junctures of the main parts and lack of sequence in the details of the gnomic passages, but a central idea with subordinate ideas has been planned and successfully set forth.

This analysis of the poem, I am convinced, is confirmed, not shattered by a consideration of rival hypotheses. I select three recent utterances as typical. That of Meyer I have already examined. A ferocious onslaught on the unity of the poem is made in the last edition of von Christ's *Griechische Litteraturgeschichte*.¹ It is there declared that all parts of the poem which do not mention Perses are later additions, presumably having nothing to do with him at all. The remainder consists of two poems, both addressed to Perses, one, apparently, before the trial, the other at some later time. Let us see how the actual details fit into this scheme.

The first poem to Perses is supposed to include vv. 11-48 and 213-316. The first of these sections includes the passage on *Ἔρις* and just the beginning of the Prometheus story. The last lines would be (47-48):

ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἔκρυνε χολωσάμενος φρεσὶ ἦσιν.
ὅττι μιν ἔξαπάτησε Προμηθεὺς ἀγκυλομήτης.

This makes a sudden ending. Why not add the next line,

τοῖνεκ' ἄρ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἐμήσατο κήδεα λυγρά?

Perhaps the author of this theory felt a danger in so doing, as the phrase might well refer to something about to follow. Surely, if that is so, and you include only the beginning of v. 50 *κρύψε δὲ πῦρ* you must go on to the end of the story.

detailed precepts of the concluding passages; *ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων* both Religion and Justice, though perhaps the latter idea is more prominent; cf. Theog. 217-220: *Μοίρας . . . αἱ τ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε παραιβασίας ἐφέπονσιν*. Even supposing, as Proclus in his scholia states (see also Christ, op. cit., p. 116), that v. 828 may have been appended to form a transition to the *Ὀρνιθομαντεία*, the phrase *ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν* might suggest both Justice and Religion. But Proclus's suggestion is too bold even for Rzach (cf. also above, p. 131, n. 2, on the ending of the Theog.). See Paley's note, ad loc., and also that of Waltz, who aptly remarks that *δρνιθας κρίνων* means here 'observing the rites' and completes the summary of the poem.

¹ 1910, § 68 (pp. 114 ff.).

The other section (213-316) includes the passage on Justice (213-285) and part (286-316) of that on Work. But we have noticed that in the first of these, there are two evident references to the Myth of the Ages (225 ff.; 252 ff.); at least these two passages gain distinctly in intensity if they presuppose the myth. The part of the passage on Work is made to stop for no cogent reason at 316.¹ Poor Hesiod's attempt at a finale, which in all conscience is clear enough,

ὦδ' ἔρδειν καὶ ἔργον ἐπ' ἔργῳ ἐργάζεσθαι (382),

makes no impression on the higher critic. Of course it would be dangerous to keep on to this finale, for then it would be hard not to add the passage on Farming.

The "late additions" are the passage on Farming (383-617), with a segment of the introductory part on Work (317-382), the passages on Sailing (618-694), Social Duties (695-764) and Days (765-828), the fable of Prometheus (49-104) and the fable of the Ages (109-201). But again, if you accept *all* the passage on Work, the succeeding passages link themselves at once with it, while the first fable answers a question raised in the preceding part (v. 40 ff.) and the second is deliberately connected with the first by verses 106-108 (*ἕτερόν τοι ἐγὼ λόγον ἐκκορυφώσω*, etc.). These verses the critic simply scratches out. There are also scratched out, apart from lesser interpolations, verses 202-212, the fable to the Judges. This last² is certainly incriminating matter, for it contains the implication that the preceding fables were addressed to Perses. One portion which von Christ³ had deleted, as "ein elendes Flickwerk", namely the invocation (1-10), is now declared genuine,⁴ but the statement made in the former edition is retained, that "eine vollkommene Einheit bilden die 828 Verse des Gedichts in keinem Fall".⁵ I cannot help thinking that in such an analysis as this, hypercriticism reduces itself to an absurdity.

A third hypothesis is that of Pierre Waltz, in his dissertation on Hesiod⁶ and his edition of the Works and Days. He

¹ No more compelling is the hypothesis of Fuss that Poem I ends with v. 335. See above p. 148, n. 5.

² In the preceding edition of 1905 (p. 97), it is included with 213-316.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ed. of 1910, p. 115.

⁵ Ibid., p. 114.

⁶ See above, p. 131. n. 1.

presents what seems to me a convincing argument for the unity of the poem, only that by accepting Schoemann's emendation of verse 39, he thereby assumes the time of writing as after the trial.¹ But emendation of so important a passage is highly suspicious,² and besides, does not dispose of other passages which most naturally imply that the trial is yet to take place.³ Combining Waltz's argument for the unity of the poem with Meyer's treatment of verse 39 and the whole portion which he thinks an earlier poem, I would conclude that the poem is a unit and that it was written before the trial. I would return, that is, to the old-fashioned reading of the poem. Such orthodoxy has become to-day, I am aware, the vilest heresy; the theory of Götting, which according to Colonel Mure⁴ was random conjecture and ought never to have been admitted to Smith's Dictionary of Classical Biography, has won such a place that even French critics have bowed to it. The brothers Croiset, who in their earlier work,⁵ denied the possibility of extracting "later additions" from the poem, and accepted its "unité primitive", have advocated in their later abridgement⁶ an hypothesis which seems half-way between the views of Meyer and of Christ. Masqueray declares, in a review of Waltz,⁷ that while one may not go the length of Fick's or Kirchhoff's analyses, it is just as reprehensible to fly to the other extreme and accept the unity of the poem. But such a *via media* as Masqueray's merely illustrates the obsession of fashion. If there is evidence against the unity of the poem, we must examine it, but the hypothesis that the poem is a unit is not an extreme, but our proper starting-point.⁸

¹ Dissertation, p. 43; edition, p. 91.

² See above, p. 133, n. 1.

³ See above, p. 133, n. 4, on the invocation (1-10), and p. 143, n. 2, on the fable of the nightingale and the hawk (202-212).

⁴ Op. cit., II 396, note, and in general, II 383 ff.

⁵ Histoire de la litt. grecque, edit. 2, 1896, I 469 ff., esp. 475. This volume is by Maurice Croiset, but it presumably represents the opinion of both authors.

⁶ Manuel d'hist. de la litt. grecque, 1900. See the seventh ed. (which mentions both of Waltz's works), p. 91 ff.

⁷ Rev. des Études Anc., 1908, 99. See also Rev. des Études Grecques, 1908, 142, where he remarks that the unity of the poem "n'est démontrable que grâce à un excès de bonne volonté". Apart from this matter, Masqueray gives Waltz's book high praise.

⁸ I have found few reviews of Waltz outside of France and Belgium. His works are not noticed in the last edition of Christ's Litteraturgeschichte. Of the French critics, Cuny (Rev. des Études Anc., 1909, 280 ff.) is non-com-

I have spent the greater part of this paper in an attempt, not gratuitous at the present moment, to assert the unity of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, but the point upon which I would have the argument converge is the definition of the poet's temperament. When he can be described by an appreciative critic of Greek literature¹ as the "type of the grumbling farmer in any age", who shows "an embittered egotism in all the relations of life", there is still room for restatement. We must ponder again as to just what Hesiod's feelings were when he wrote this poem to his brother at a critical moment. Once more, he is morally aroused, but he does not belabour Perses with the cudgel of a righteous wrath. In Dryden's words,² he exposes the folly of the man without arraigning his vices; he adopts, in a word, the method of Horatian satire. The moral of contentment and industry is also Horatian, and Horace never put it more neatly than in the maxim that the half is better than the whole. In one aspect, then, as we have seen,³ the poem seems gnomic rather than technically didactic. Hesiod is not so much interested in discoursing on the art of farming as in inducing Perses to work. There are distinctly both strands in the poet's woof, and many a reader may find that they do not match. The reproof of an unjust and ungrateful brother loses something of its effect when combined with detailed instructions to a supposedly docile farmer. We are not doing Hesiod justice if we do not recognize this contradiction, but we do him still greater injustice in removing it off-hand by the easy hypothesis of later revisions or interpolations, by whittling down a mighty temperament to suit the capacity of average common sense. By recognizing in the poem a vein of Horatian urbanity, we shall see that the two apparently discordant elements merge in a larger harmony. Hesiod wishes to give advice as well as reproof; leisurely didactic exposition pointed by sly thrusts of satire may fittingly accompany a moral protest. Take Horace's apology for satire;⁴ his aim is at once to define the nature of satire, to defend himself against certain

mittal as to the unity of the poem, while Croiset and Masqueray, as we have seen, do not accept it. It is accepted, apparently, by Labaste (*Rev. des Études Grecques*, 1908, 477), by a reviewer in *Rev. de l'Instr. Publ. en Belg.* (1909, 332 f.), and by J. Sitzler (*Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1910, 1467).

¹ Mrs. W. C. Wright, *A Short Hist. of Greek Lit.*, 1907, pp. 58, 59.

² Discourse Concerning Satire, in his *Poetical Works*, ed. G. R. Noyes, Cambridge, 1908, p. 283.

³ See above, p. 149 f.

⁴ Sat. I, 4.

admirers of Lucilius, gently to poke fun at them, and to commend the lessons in morality given him by his father. This satire is of course not an exact parallel to Hesiod's poem, but it illustrates a similar harmony of diverse moods. Considering Horace's temperament as a whole, we have seen¹ that his urbanity is not incompatible with a sincere, if momentary, pessimism, which has its counterpart in Hesiod too.

For a bland Horatian satirist a well developed sense of humour is essential. Hesiod had this, and likewise that sympathy, with which as Thackeray remarked, satire must walk arm-in-arm. There is nothing uproariously funny in the *Works and Days*, but there are all manner of delightful descriptive touches, at once humorous and sympathetic, especially in the passages on Farming and Sailing. Mure² and others have noted his quaint habit of coining epithets for men and beasts in stead of the names that convention has given them; thus the ant is called 'The Provident', the snail 'The House-carrier', the cuttlefish, 'The Boneless One', the burglar, 'The Day-Sleeper'. The same spirit is at work in many of the descriptions, as in the lines on the quadragenarian hired-man and his systematic meal (441), on the small boy planter who disappoints the birds (469), on the dust-covered reaper, mad at his luck (481), on the old man set running by the cold (518), on the freezing animals loping about on three legs (533), on Perses' goose-flesh (539), on the little 'House-carrier' crawling to the shelter of the vines to escape the rainy Pleiades (571), on the advantage of commending a small boat and putting your wares in a big one (643). Such descriptions, of which other examples might be cited,³ are not at all unlike the vivid little pictures with which Horace brightens his satiric discourses here and there. A writer who can treat details thus pleasantly might interpret a larger situation in the same way.

We must infer that he has done so if the unity of the poem has been proved. Satiric and humorous touches in the *Works and Days* have often been pointed out before,⁴ but they will throw a

¹ See above, pp. 141 f.

² *Op. cit.* II 393 f.; also Waltz, dissertation, p. 571, edition, p. 31.

³ E. g., vv. 475, 524, 585, 679; *Theog.* 35, 769.

⁴ Especially by Waltz, e. g., edition, p. 28: "les allusions satiriques, tantôt d'une bonhomie malicieuse, tantôt plus âpres et plus mordantes"; dissertation, p. 131; "le poète ne peut faire aucun retour sur lui-même et sur son entourage sans qu'une intention satirique se mêle à ses préoccupations de moraliste". See also above, p. 152, n. 2.

new light on the poet's temperament if we consider them in relation to their setting. We must find in Hesiod a lordly magnanimity as well as sound common sense if he wrote all of his poem before the trial, aware that the object of his satire might prove the future owner of his estate. Suppose that *faenerator Alfius* had had similar designs on the Sabine farm. I will not say that Horace would not have stood the test, but he would have needed what we may now call a Hesiodic urbanity to help him through. Just what the suit was, except that it was something critical,¹ or how it was settled, we do not know; more important for our consideration are Hesiod's feelings at the time.

This, then, is the poem with which Hesiod answers his brother. If we may now make a final attempt at definition, we cannot call it technically didactic, though it contains technical elements; it has likewise gnomic and personal and narrative elements.² Its main object is to present to his erring brother, in the abstract and the concrete, those principles which lead to a happy and successful life. It suggests a philosophical essay, something like Seneca's *De Vita Beata*, or Cicero's *De Senectute*, in which latter work the part on agriculture³ occupies about the same relation to the whole that the passage on the same subject does in the *Works and Days*. The nearest analogue in poetry to our work is moral satire; no single one of Horace's satires is closely parallel, but you can extract from all of Horace's works bits that are closely akin. Perhaps we should say that Horace has been gathering crumbs from Hesiod's table, though Quintilian's assertion⁴ still is true that *satura quidem tota nostra est*. Hesiod was perhaps not aware that he was writing moral satire. If he reflected at all on literary types, he regarded the present work as catalogue poetry, of which, according to antiquity, he wrote other specimens. Hence the wholly admirable title, "*Works and Days*".

¹ See above, p. 132, n. 3.

² Waltz, edition, p. 16, calls the work "ni un poème didactique objectif, ni un traité de morale d'une portée universelle; Hésiode ne perd jamais de vue le point de départ de ses préceptes, ses démêlés avec son frère". This definition certainly makes of the poem too personal an affair, as Masqueray has well pointed out; *Rev. des Études Anc.*, 1908, 98-99; *Rev. Crit.*, 1908, I, 141. I should say rather that the poem is a moral and didactic treatise of general bearings and intended particularly for Hesiod's brother.

³ 51-59.

⁴ 10, I, 93.

A point that has influenced the disruptive critics is, as we have seen,¹ the fact that in the two concluding sections of the poem, Perses is not named. Now that the whole sweep of the poem is before us, I would revert to this matter and inquire whether it is at all surprising. It is natural that a work of apologetic nature should begin with the personal and concrete and end with the general and abstract. Thus Boethius in prison first seeks the consolation of philosophy for his own wrongs and then develops this consolation into a theodicy. Just so the last part of Hesiod's poem is more general than the first. But even in the first part the tone is not wholly personal. In the fable of Prometheus, which is as long as the passage on Days (64 verses), Perses is not called by name, nor do we know, as we read, that 'you' in vv. 106-107, means him. We think that it may, and on reaching the fable to the Princes (202) we infer that it must, but until that point, for a stretch of 90 verses more, in which the fable of the Ages is told, no mention is made of Perses; the two fables occupy considerably more space than do the passages on Social Precepts and Days (134 verses). Hesiod changes his tone, then, throughout the poem, according to the nature of his subject.

We may find a further reason for these shifts if we assume that Hesiod read his poem to an audience. Meyer declares, with refreshing boldness,² "dass Hesiod mit der Feder gearbeitet hat, und zwar so intensiv wie nur je ein Gelehrter". Doubtless, but we know also, unless we scratch out verses 654-662 that Hesiod took part in contests of poetry. M. Croiset,³ believes that his poems were always intended for recitation, and that the *Works and Days* was presented piecemeal to different audiences. I do not suppose that the poem was written at a sitting; it shows the results of considerable pondering and of experimentation with radically different literary types. I can conceive that parts of it had been written for purposes other than the rebuking of Perses, and were adapted to the new plan; one sure instance is the story of Prometheus, which he had already told, with a difference, in the *Theogony*. But whatever the genesis of the poet's thought and tentative expression, the poem as we have it was composed, I believe, for a definite occasion, the trial, and was finished before the trial came off. Imagine a gathering of people from Ascra and the neighbouring villages; Perses and the gift-devouring

¹ Above, p. 154.

² Op. cit., p. 168, n. 1.

³ Op. cit., I 475 ff.

judges are among them, wondering what the poet will find to say. Or if we suppose them absent, the imagination of the poet can summon them to the place. He thus has various auditors to address, or, at least, various tones to assume. Waltz remarks acutely:¹

"L'enseignement d'Hésiode avait perdu toute chance de succès, si une excessive sévérité dans l'expression avait rebuté ses naïfs auditeurs".

Those remarks carry all the more weight if the scene is laid before the trial. The recitation would have the impressiveness of drama, and like a drama, would depend for part of its effect upon changes in tone, in literary form and in modes of address; now there is a solemn appeal to Zeus, now a word of warning to Perses or of defiance to the princes, now a thrust of satire for them both, now a fable with a moral for them and for all. The poem ends with something like liturgy, which is expressed, as is right, in general not personal terms. This alternation between the general and the personal is, again, dramatic and effective; though not arranged in any definite system, it resembles the change from chorus to dialogue in a play. On the same principle of contrast, too, the scene shifts in epic from the battle-field to Olympus and back.

To conclude, I would abide by our text and accept the poem as a unit. Though the author may have written parts of it long before, he composed before the trial a work essentially new and, most probably, read it to an audience which, in reality or in imagination, included Perses and the Princes. Under the circumstances, the kind of retaliation that Hesiod made for his brother's wrongdealing bespeaks a calm and lofty mind. Hesiod's temperament is rich in moods, but is not for that reason disordered.² He has moments of prophetic fervor, of sturdy hopes and sturdy despair, but such a poem could have been written at such a time only by a man who, master of himself and of his future, could

¹ Dissertation, p. 135.

² M. Croiset, *op. cit.*, I 486 says admirably of Hesiod's qualities: "l'accent personnel d'Hésiode est fait de rudesse, de familiarité, d'ironie mordante, de bonhomie, d'amertume, de grâce sérieuse, en un mot d'une foule de choses contradictoires, qui parfois éclatent en lui toutes à la fois", etc. So Waltz, dissertation, p. 137, speaks of "ce perpétuel mélange de majesté et de bonhomie", etc. On p. 81 he notes such qualities as "la franchise, la prévoyance, la modération, la discrétion".

treat his antagonists with the placidity of an Horatian satirist. In the "miserable little town of Ascra", far back in the history of Greek letters, we find the same genial raillery and wise urbanity, the same moral earnestness, too, that later shed their pleasant light upon the Sabine farm. Virgil, who in the first book of his *Georgics*, took Hesiod for his model in a fashion still imperfectly understood,¹ had long before penetrated deeply into the spirit of the *Works and Days*. For in his *Culex*² he calls that shepherd who follows with devotion the poet of Ascra, not an embittered egotist or grumbling farmer, but one who

securam placido traducit pectore vitam.

E. K. RAND.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

¹ In brief, the first half of Bk. I, after the invocation is *Ἔργα*, most of the second half is *Ἡμέραι*; at the end Virgil catches up the Hesiodic strain into epic. Virgil, despite Conington, knew what he was about when he spoke of 'singing the song of Ascra through the streets of Rome' (*Georg.* 2, 176).

Waltz, diss., p. 107, speaking of Virgil, finds nothing idyllic in Hesiod. There is nothing romantic, but both Virgil and Hesiod prized contentment, and both had a vision of a very similar golden age. I am confident that we need a new study of Hesiod's influence upon the Roman poets, especially Virgil and Horace.

² *Vv.* 94 ff.

II.—LATIN INSCRIPTIONS AT THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

VI.¹

This article is devoted to a part of the sepulchral inscriptions of the Johns Hopkins collection. Except where a definite statement is made to the contrary all of them are of Roman origin.

48. Slab of white marble 0,31 m. wide and 0,56 high with the following inscription:

D . M
A E L I A E . P . F .
P H O E B E S
Q V A E . V I X . A N N . X .
M E N S . I I . D . X X I .
P . A E L I V S . P H O E B I O N . E T
A E L I A . I A N V A R I A . P A R E N
T E S . F E C E R . A N I M V L A E . D V L C .
H I C . A N I M A . D V L C I S . T E R R A . T E G I T V R

The letters are well and deeply cut and in some cases still preserve traces of minium. This stone seems to have come from the same burial place as VI, 10948, which was found "in vinea Naria via Salaria" (Marini) about 1741-42: d. m. s. | Aeliae p. fil. Phoebes | quae vix(it) ann(os) x, m(enses) ii, d(ies) xxi. | P. Aelius Phoebion et Aelia | Ianuaria, parentes, filiae | dulcissimae fecerunt et | sibi et suis libert(is) libertabusq(ue) | posterisque eorum. h(uic) m(onumento) d(olus) m(alus) a(besto). | In fronte p(edes) vii; in agr(rum) p(edes) vii s. This is of course the general stone for the whole lot, whereas our inscription marked only the resting place of little Aelia Phoebe. Another Aelia Phoebe appears in VI, 10949, but she was a daughter of one T. Aelius. The use of *animula* as a tender epithet for the dead is not unusual and is found with *dulcissima* in VI, 7947. Still more common is *anima*, especially with *dulcis* and *dulcis-*

¹The preceding articles of this series appeared in this Journal, XXVIII, 1907, pp. 450 ff.; XXX, 1909, pp. 61 ff., 153 ff.; and XXXI, 1910, pp. 25 ff., 251 ff.

sima. Another instance is seen below in number 50, and a full list of examples is given by Olcott, *Thes. Ling. Epig.*, I, p. 314-5.

49. Small slab of white marble, 0,24 m. wide and 0,17 high, originally part of a double tablet from a columbarium. At the left is the hole for one of the nails by which it was attached to the wall, but on the right side, which is roughly broken, remain some traces of the conventional pattern which divided the tablet perpendicularly into two approximately equal parts. The inscription, which is cut in fairly good letters, is as follows:

CN · AEMILIO
FELICI
SVCCSSVS · L.
B · D · S · M

At the end of the third line there is a trace of a lost letter, probably L, standing for *libertus*. The abbreviation in the last line for b(ene) d(e) s(e) m(erito) is common: cf. number 69 below.

50. Slab of white marble, 0,60 m. wide and 0,36 high, bearing the following inscription, carefully cut in small letters of a style closely resembling the *scriptura actuaria*:

DOMVI AETERNAE CONSECRATAE ♂	
♂ AVGVRIA ANIMA · DVLCIS ET INNOCVA · HAVE ♂	AGILEIAE PRIMAE Q · È AVGVRIAE VXORI SVpra AETATEM CASTISSIMAE ET PVDICISSIMAE · ET FRUGALISSIMAE QVAE INNOCENTER MARITVM · ET DOMVM · EIVS AMAVIT OMNIA DE SE MERENTI FECIT Q · OPPIVS SECVNDVS MARITVS ET SIBI TEMPORE QVO SVM GENITA · NATVRA · MIHI · BIS DENOS TRIBVIT ANNOS QVIBVS COMPLETIS SEPTIMA DEINDE DIE · RESOLVTA LEGIBVS OTIO SVM PERPETVO · TRADITA HAEC MIHI · VITA · FVIT OPPI NE METVAS LETHEN · NAM STVLTVM · EST · TEMPORE · ET OM NI · DVNC · MORTEM · METVAS · AMITTERE GAVDIA · VITAE · MORS · ETENIM · HOMINVM · NATVRA · NON · POENA · EST · CVI · CONTIGIT · NASCI · INSTAT · ET · MORI · IGITVR · DOMINE OPPI MARITE NE DOLEAS MEI · QVOD PRAECESSI SVSTINEO IN AETERNO TORO ADVENTVM TVVM VALETE SVPERI · ET · CVNCTI · CVNCTAEQVE · VALETE ·
	♂ AVGVRIA INNOCVA ANIMA · TVA · IN BONO · ♂

This inscription was published in VI, 11252 on the basis of a copy made by Gatti, whose reading varies from the stone only in

the placing of a few points. The most striking feature here, as in number 81 below, is the metrical character of certain parts of the inscription, for example, of lines 10 and 11 where we find two complete hexameters:

Ne metuas Lethen nam stultum est tempore et omni
Du(m) mortem metuas amittere gaudia vitae.

In line 15 also we have a complete iambic senarius:

Sustineo in aeterno toro adventum tuum,

and in line 9 the latter half of a pentameter: *haec mihi vita fuit*. Similarly the last line, except at the beginning, is a good hexameter: $\angle \cup \cup \angle$ *superi et cuncti cunctaeque valete*, and slight changes produce the same result in line 12: *Mors etenim natura hominum, non poena (deorum) est*.¹ That most of these passages are due to literary reminiscence is very probable and the sources of some of them are pointed out in the brief notes which follow.

Line 2. *Auguria* is a nickname, as is shown by Q · E (= *quae et*): compare *Auguriorum* in VI, 10269. Its use as a cognomen and finally as a nomen naturally follows. See the examples in *Thes. Ling. Lat.* II, 1370, 47 ff.

Line 8. With *resoluta legibus* compare *Sil. It. xi, 36, resolutam legibus urbem*; though of course *legibus* has not the same force in the two passages.

Line 10. With the exception of the first words we have an almost exact quotation from the *Disticha Catonis* (II, 3, p. 223 B.) *Linque metum leti; nam stultum est tempore in omni, dum mortem metuas, amittere gaudia vitae*. This seems to be the earliest *testimonium* to the *Disticha*, but as we cannot fix the date of the inscription, it avails little in determining the date of Cato.²

Line 12. Not only the thought but the expression of this and the following line is derived from Seneca, who repeatedly gives voice to similar sentiments. The writer of the inscription was probably thinking of a passage in the *De remediis fortuitorum* (II, 1 in Haase III, p. 447) which reads: *morieris, ista hominis natura est, non poena*, and in this reminiscence bears the earl witness to a work which some scholars have refused to acknowledge as Seneca's. The case for Annaean authorship is some-

¹ This was suggested by Buecheler, *Carm. Epig.*, 1567, who grouped together a number of epitaphs of this character.

² Cf. C. Hosius, *Rhein. Mus.* 50, 1895, p. 300; Buecheler, *Carm. Epig.*, p. 858; Schanz, *Gesch. röm. Litt.*, § 519, p. 34.

what strengthened by the immediately following reflection of a passage in Seneca, Epist. 99, § 8, *omnis eadem condicio devinxit: cui nasci contigit, mori restat*. Other passages of Seneca which have a bearing are Dial. XII, 13, 2, *ultimum diem non quasi poenam, sed quasi naturae legem adspicis*; Nat. Quaest. VI, 32, 12, *mors naturae lex est*; Epigr. I, 7 (Poet. Lat. Min. IV, 1), *lex est, non poena perire*.

Line 14. *Ne doleas* is a common beginning for the hexameter in epitaphs, e. g., Buecheler, Carm. Epig., 775 and 1407.

Line 15. With *aeterno toro* compare XI, 1122, *et iuxta coniunx meritos testatur honores Aeternum retinens consociata torum*, and III, 2490, *aeterno iungit pia membra cubili*.

Line 16. *Valete superi*: cf. V, 4078, *valete ad superos*. For *superi* in the sense of *superstites* see note on number 89 below.

The phrase *anima dulcis et innocua* of the left *ansa* has its parallel in a Christian inscription of the year 388 given by De Rossi, 370, *anima dulces innoca*. See also V, 170, *animae innocuae* and note on *anima dulcis* in number 48 above. With *in bono* of the right *ansa* compare a Christian inscription in Marucchi, n. 108, Attice, *spiritus tuus in bono*.

51. Small columbarium tablet, 0,18 m. wide and 0,10 high, with the usual holes at the ends and the nail on the right side still preserved. It is now in the possession of Dr. R. V. D. Magoffin, Johns Hopkins University. The inscription, cut in fairly good letters, is as follows:

L · ALBATIVS
PRIMIO

The *gens Albatia* is rarely attested and seems to belong to Etruria. In XI, 1355 two officials of the collegium fabrum tignuariorum at Luna are Q. Albatius Corinthus and Q. Albatius Verna, and Phlegon Trall. (III, 609 Müller) mentions 'Αλβατία Σαβίνα πόλεως Πάρμης.

52. Travertine pigna from Palestrina, 0,25 m. in height, with the following inscription on the shoulder:

ALBINIVS

The name Albinus appears twice at Praeneste, namely XIV, 2968 and 2974. Here the absence of praenomen as well as the character of the cutting arouse suspicion of the genuineness of the inscription, which is rightly rejected by Dessau, Eph. Epig.,

IX, p. 450. Of the antiquity of the pigna itself there can be no doubt.

This inscription was published by Magoffin, *American Journal of Archaeology*, XIV, 1910, p. 51.

53. Front portion of a circular urn of white marble, which now measures 0,22 m. in width and 0,205 in height. On a sculptured *tabula ansata* (0,13 m. wide and 0,14 high) is cut in good letters the following inscription:

C N · A N N A E Q
E V N̄ O M O
C A L T I L I A
G E N I C E
C O I V G · B · M *f.*

At the lower right hand corner a portion of the stone is broken away, carrying with it a part of the M and almost all of the F, which like the O in the first line ran over on the surrounding molding. As a rule, C and G are hardly to be distinguished on this stone: only in the initial of the fourth line is the form at all characteristic.

54. Tablet of pavonazzetto, 0,35 m. wide and 0,14 high, with the usual holes at the ends and with deeply cut lines in the form of a *tabula ansata*. The stone came from outside the porta Salaria and bears the following inscription, which is well cut, though in a somewhat vulgar style:

A N T I S T I A · V R B A N A
F E C I T · A E D I C V L A M · S I B I
E T · L · A N T I S T I O · I L I S S O
F I L I O · S V O
I S V I X I T A N N I S X V I I I

The use of *aedicula* with reference to the tomb or a part of it is very common at Rome though rarely found elsewhere. Thus the phrase *fecit aediculam* occurs again and again in the sixth volume of the *Corpus*, e. g. VI, 11685, 12677, 15547, 17652, 22584. The use of *Ilissus* as a cognomen or as a slave's name is not very common, but may be seen in IX, 484, Q. Atilio Q. l. Ilisso, and possibly also 4909 (see Mommsen's note). The

absence of the father's name as well as the coincidence of the nomina of mother and son points to illegitimacy.

55. Tablet of white marble, 0,445 m. wide and 0,18 high, bearing the following inscription:

CN · ANTONI · LAVMEDI *sic*
 AEMILIAI · O · L · HELICONIAI
 CN · ANTONI · CN · L *sic*
 MOSCHIONI

The letters are deeply cut and square, showing a certain lack of finish which recalls the work of late republican times, though I should not venture to assign it to so early a period. The fourth line and most of the third, as indicated by the inclined capitals, were cut *in rasura*, but no traces of earlier letters, if such existed, remain. LAVMEDI is the dative of Laumedes or Laomedes, which seems to be otherwise unattested either in Greek or in Latin. Compare, however, the equivalent form Λαωμήδης which occurs in I. G., II, 1010; XII, 293, 4; ib. 277, 142 (Thasos). Since therefore the dative is required, the graver should have cut ANTONIO in both instances. The dative in *-ai* is not unknown during the empire, e. g. VI, 921, Antoniai Augustai of the time of Claudius. Gnaeus as a praenomen in the *gens Antonia* is very rare, but occurs, e. g., in IX, 5428 (Falerio), Antonia Cn. fil. Picentina.

56. Tablet of marble, 0,305 m. wide and 0,22 high, with two holes for nails, one on the left at the top and the other on the right at the middle. The inscription, well cut in a style that can scarcely be later than the middle of the second century and still showing abundant traces of minium, runs as follows:

DLS · MÂNIBVS
 APPVLEIAE · GRATILLAE
 VIX · AN · XIII · M · VI · D · XV ·
 FECERVNT ·
 CN · COSSVTIVS · APRICLVS
 ET · APPVLEIA · LOCHIAS ·
 PATRONI · VERNAE · KARISSIMAE
 ET · L · APPVLEIVS · REGILLVS · TATA

All these proper names are already well attested. Of the cognomina Lochias is the most common and Apricius the least

frequent. It occurs, however, in VI, 1057, (7), 42, T. Anneius Apricu(s) and the feminine Apricla in VI, 16694 and 17794. TATA in the last line seems in this case, as often, to mean grandfather.¹

57. Small *tabula ansata*, 0,24 m. wide and 0,095 high, from a columbarium. The nails are still preserved in the holes at the ends. The marble, which was worked to a smooth surface only on the front, bears the following inscription :

A T T I C A
T I B · C A E S E R I S · L E I B sic

The letters are well formed and deeply cut and still show traces of minium. The date seems to be after 4 A. D., when Tiberius was adopted by Augustus, but before his accession in 14. The very natural error CAESERIS occurs also in IV, 2308, VI, 9492 and XIV, 2519. The use of the long form of I in EI (=i), though seen not rarely in republican inscriptions, is more common in the first century.²

58. Small slab of marble, 0,23 m. wide and 0,30 high, roughly chipped and broken on all sides, yet with slight injury to the inscription. The text, which is cut in fine square letters of a good period, runs as follows :

C · A V I L I V S
M E N O F H I L V S
FRONIME
F E C I T · F I L I A
D V L C I S S I M a
Q V A E · V I X I t
A N N I S · X I I I
D I E B V S · X V I I

Above FILIA in the third line FRONIME was added in small cramped letters, whether by the same or a later graver it is

¹ For a detailed discussion of the use of this and similar childish words, see W. Heraeus, *die Sprache der röm. Kinderstube*, in *Archiv f. lat. Lex.*, XIII, 148 ff., and especially 155. The examples in C. I. L. VI are given by Harrod, *Latin Terms of Endearment etc.*, pp. 53 and 57.

² J. Christiansen, *De apicibus et i longis inscriptionum latinarum*, p. 28 f.

impossible to determine. In *MENOFHILVS* too in the second line some later unskilled hand attempted to change the F to a P. Owing to the chipping away of the stone, letters have been lost at the ends of lines two, four, and five; possibly also of lines six and seven, though on this last point one may not speak with confidence. The *gens Avilia*, or *Avillia*, as it more commonly appears on the stones, is well attested both in Italy and in the provinces.¹ Strangely enough we find another *Avillius Menophilus* in VI, 34596, L. *Avilli* L. l. *Menophili*.

59. Fragment of marble whose extreme measurements are 0,175 m. wide (at the bottom) and 0,13 high (at the right side). The inscription, which is scratched rather than cut in a very vulgar style, is as follows:

REL
SSECV
NDVSA
VRELIA

To complete this we seem to need at the beginning of the first line a praenomen and AV and at the beginning of the second line IV, thus making it read [M(?) Au]rel | [iu]s Secu | nduss (?) A | urelia. The former S in the third line is written within the V and seems to be superfluous.

On the other side of this stone is scratched a picture of the crudest sort which displays about as much artistic skill as the graffiti of idlers usually show.² In the middle is represented something that looks like an erect tombstone coming to a point at the top. In the main field of this tombstone is a rough drawing of a human figure with large head and very slender body and legs. Above the head in the triangular space at the top is the word *PIVS*. Behind the tombstone—if such it is—stands a horse, hidden for the most part, but showing his head on the right and his haunches on the left of the stone. Above the horse's head is a circle and above that again a bird, and on the other side above the horse's haunches is an X with a character like a reversed N beneath it. To frame some ingenious theory

¹ Fullest list of occurrences in *Thes. Ling. Lat.*, II, 1451.

² Examples of such drawings may be seen in *Not. d. Scav.*, 1904, p. 155, 1907, p. 546, and in *Wuensch Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom*, pp. 8 ff.

in explanation of all this would not be difficult, but it seems wiser as well as nearer the truth to say that its significance is not apparent.

60. Lower part of the front of a marble cinerary urn, 0,39 m. wide and 0,115 high. Between the bases of the fluted pilasters which marked the corners is the space set apart for the name of the dead. The inscription, which is well cut, though not in the finest monumental style, is as follows:

FLORA · BAEBIA · > · L

The *gens Baebia* is one of the old plebeian families of Rome and gave to the Republic men of high rank in both peace and war. Flora is very common as the name of slaves and freedwomen and of course the particular Baebia who was her *patrona*, cannot be identified. Other recently discovered members of the *gens* are reported in Not. d. Scav., 1899, p. 79; 1903, p. 351; 1905, p. 300 and L'Ann. Epig., 1903, nn. 189, 234, 363.

61. Small marble tablet, 0,21 m. wide and 0,125 high, still preserving the nails by which it was attached to the wall of the tomb. The inscription, which is well cut and of a good period, is as follows:

C · CALPURNIVS
C · L
SABINVS

The names are too common to call for remark. Even a Calpurnius Sabinus occurs in VI, 14196 and a Calpurnia Sabina in VI, 14249.

62. Pigna of travertine from Palestrina, 0,38 m. in height, ornamented with a conventional leaf pattern on the throat. The inscription, which is well cut in letters probably of the second century B. C., consists of the single word

CAMELIA

This family is well attested at Praeneste in XIV, 3080-3084. The Camelia of 3083 doubtless belongs to an earlier generation on account of the form of L with the acute angle at the base.¹

¹ This inscription was first published by Magoffin, l. c., p. 52, n. 4. Dessau, Ephem. Epig. IX, p. 450 is clearly mistaken in identifying it with XIV, 3083.

63. Marble cinerary urn in the form of a temple, measuring 0,26 m. wide, 0,21 deep and 0,265 high to the peak. The roof is carved to represent a covering of leaf-shaped tiles and has an antefix at each corner. In the pediment are sacrificial emblems in relief, the patera in the centre, the pitcher at the left, and the sprinkler at the right. Between the pilasters which stand at the corners is the usual space for the inscription, which is carefully cut in a good style and reads as follows:

DI | S · MANIBVS
CLAVDIO
ALEXANDRO

Here again the names are very common. In VI, 4469 we have C. Claudius Alexander, ib. 14912-3 Ti. Claudius Alexander and ib. 34856 Claudius Alexander. On the form DI | S, which occurs also in number 71 below and in VI, 19878, see Christiansen, l. c., p. 33.

64. Sepulchral altar of white marble, now broken into two pieces, 0,255 m. wide, 0,16 deep, and 0,66 high, with the usual volutes at the top and the *urceus* and *patera* on the sides. In the top are five holes, one at each corner and one in the centre, for the metal clamps by which some object was attached. The inscription, surrounded by the usual moldings, is well cut in the monumental style and reads as follows:

	D · M	
	TI · CLAVDIO	
	PROCLO · FE	
	CIT · FLAVIA	
<i>urceus</i>	<u>PRIMITIVA</u>	<i>patera</i>
	COIVGI · SVO	
	BENEMERENTI	
	HOMINI BONO	

This inscription was first copied in the latter part of the fifteenth century by *Glucundus*, and appears in C. I. L., VI, 15231. Here the editors, following *Rambertus*, have called the stone *urna* instead of *ara* and have accepted the text as given by *Armellini*,

Cronichetta, 1878, p. 192, who reports the location "in vinea via Salaria nova ad dextram paullo ultra coemeterium Priscillae". The only variant from his reading concerns the separative point in the last line, which does not appear on the stone. The synco-pated form Proclus for Proculus is by no means rare: similarly Procla for Procula. The phrase *homo bonus* appears in a Christian inscription of Mauretania (Dessau, 7762) and also occurs six times in the sixth volume. See Harrod, l. c., p. 35.

65. Tablet of white marble, 0,37 m. wide and 0,20 high, with the following inscription:

D · M · CLAVDIAE · EVTΥCHIAE
VALERIA · OLYMPIAS · MATRI
PISSIMAE · ET · L · VALERIVS · TERPNVS
COIVGI · CARISSIMAE · ET · C · PLAETO
RIVS · AMABILIS · FECERVNT
ET · SIBI · ET · SVIS · POSTERISQVE
· E O R V M ·

The letters are fairly well cut, but are probably not earlier than the end of the second century. The form of G in the fourth line and the regularly closed loop of P among other indications are suggestive of the later period. The names are all well known; even the combination Claudia Eutychia occurs in VI, 15411-18 and 34922. On the ways of writing *piissimus* in the inscriptions with reference to the I *longa*, see Christiansen, l. c., p. 34.

66. Cinerary urn of marble, 0,585 m. wide, 0,355 deep, and 0,22 high, from outside the porta Salaria. This urn is plainly but tastefully made, lacking almost entirely the ornamental carving with which many urns are overloaded. There are two compartments each with its own cover, and on the front, surrounded by the usual moldings, is the following inscription, carefully cut in good letters of early imperial times:

COELIAE · Q · L · ATHENAIDI
Q · COELIVS · PRIMVS
PATRONVS

From the same quarter comes the inscription VI, 34984, Coelia Aphrodisia and in the columbaria are 6892, Q. Coelius Q. l.

Bacchius, and 7899, Q. Coelius Hermes. But the name is common and no connection is suggested as more than possible. Probably the most prominent Q. Coelius is the praetor of VI, 91 who made a dedication to Concordia in the reign of Tiberius.

67. Small tablet of grey marble, 0.195 m. wide and 0.095 high, from outside the porta Salaria. It is now broken into two almost equal parts and bears the following inscription in letters of a careless and vulgar style :

C O S C O N I A · C A L I T Y C H E
V I X S I T · A N N O S · X V I I I
L E T O · D A T A · E S T · P R · I D V S · I V L
I D I B V S · E L A T A · E S T
I V L L O · A N T O N I O · A F R I C A N O · C O S

This stone owes its chief interest and importance to the fact that it bears the names of the consuls of 10 B. C. and thus has a definite date. Iullus Antonius was the son of the triumvir and was addressed by Horace in *Carm.* IV, 2. The spelling of his name, which appears wrongly as Iulius or Iulus in many manuscript sources not only of Horace but of other authors, was finally established by an inscription discovered on the Esquiline in the spring of 1888 (VI, 30974). This inscription is a dedication to Mercury by Augustus in 10 B. C. and gives the names of the consuls as Iullo Antonio Africano Fabio cos. Further testimony comes from VI, 12010, M. Antoni Iulli | patris l. Rufionis and now again from our inscription.¹ The mention of Africanus Fabius Maximus by his first name only is due to lack of space, as well as to the fact that Africanus was well known as a cognomen. This is also the reason why the *Chronographus* of the year 354, the *Fasti Hydatiani*, and the *Chronicon Paschale* all report Africanus and Maximus as the consuls of the year 744 A. U. C.²

¹ This question has been sufficiently discussed by Huelsen, *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1888, 667; Mommsen, *Hermes*, 1888, 155 ff. = *Phil. Schriften*, 187 f.; Buecheler, *Rhein. Mus.*, 1889, 317; Gatti, *Bull. Com.*, 1888, 235 f. and tav. XII; *Pros. Imp. Rom.*, svv.

² See *Bull. Com.*, 1888, 236 f.

Probably no name shows more varied orthography than the cognomen of our Cosconia. The form Callityche is of course the most common, but Calityche is found also in VI, 26265, 28333 and Bull. Com., 1907, p. 197; Calithyce in VI, 11018, 27615, 33649; Caletyce in Not. d. Scav., 1909, p. 461 and Bull. Com., 1906, p. 315; Calytice in Bull. Com., 1906, p. 99; Callituche in VI, 4510, 6185, 18302; Callityce in VI, 10676; Callytyche in VI, 16537. Burial on the next day after death was unusual in ancient as in modern times, but examples are recorded in the humbler walks of life and especially in Christian inscriptions. In this case the season may have had its influence. Other instances are Marucchi, Epigrafi Crist., n. 328, recessit die Mercuris ora viii et deposita die Iovis Iduum Maiarum; ib. n. 341, defunctus est diae (?) Saturni et sepultus diae (?) Solis vi Kal. April.; Not. d. Scav., 1908, p. 465, recessit viii Id. Aug. deposita est in pace vii Idus Augustas; Bull. Com., 1905, p. 310 [in pa]ce v Idus D[ecembris] dep. iiii. The use of XS for X at this period and the old formulaic expression *leto datus* quoted by Varro, L. L. vii, 42 and Festus, p. 336, 34 (de Ponor) are too well known to require further comment.

68. Tablet of white marble, 0,18 m. wide and 0,18 high, with the following inscription carefully cut in a good style:

D A D V C V S
LAMILLAE · SER
VIXIT · ANN · XX
CARVSVIIS
MA SOROR · FEC

The most interesting of these names is Lamilla, which I do not recall having met with elsewhere. It is, however, a diminutive from Lamia and similar in formation to Plotilla, Domitilla and Albucilla.¹ Daduchus as a name of slave or freedman is found, for example, in VI, 12651, 16716 and Not. d. Scav., 1902, p. 133, and Ma occurs in VI, 12471, Oppia Sp. f. Ma, ib., 2356, Orbia Ma, and XIV, 3157, Ma. On the common form SVIIS, see Christiansen, l. c., p. 33.

¹ Paucker has discussed personal names in *-illa* in Kuhn's Zeitschrift, xxiii, pp. 184-8.

69. Marble tablet, 0,225 m. wide and 0,19 high, with the following inscription, which is deeply cut but in a somewhat vulgar style :

D · M ·
CN · DOMITI D LIB
HYMNI · V · A · IV · M ·
V · D · XXIII · FECIT · HE
RACLIA MATER · FIL ·
sic PIINTISSIMO · D S · B ·
M

Hymnus and Heraclia or Heraclea are well known as names of slaves or freedmen and need no comment. The abbreviations D S · B · M signify d(e) s(e) b(ene) m(erito): cf. no. 49 above.

70. Pigna of travertine from Palestrina, 0,33 m. in height, with the following inscription on the base :

C · F A B I V S

Dessau regards this with suspicion and relegates it to a footnote in Ephem. Epig., IX, p. 450; on the whole his suspicion seems well grounded. The cutting of F in particular, with short middle stroke, looks like the work of a modern graver.

71. Tablet of marble, 0,265 m. wide and 0,135 high, with a conventional waving pattern at the top, a tree on each side and a wreath and two snakes at the bottom. The inscription, carefully cut in good letters, is as follows :

D I | S · M A N I B V S
arbor FABIAE · TERTVLLAE *arbor*
VIXIT · ANNIS · XXV
anguis *anguis*
corona

For the form D I | S, see the note on number 63 above.

72. Marble slab of triangular shape like the pediment of a building, measuring 0,44 m. wide at the bottom and 0,195 high,

and lacking a small fragment on the right side. The inscription, which is cut in a good style of the early part of the second century, reads as follows :

D X M
 FELICI · CAES ·
 N · SER · VERN · Q · V · AN ·
 XIII · MENS · X · DIEB · VII ·
 FEC · M · VLPIVS · AVG · LIB · PACATVS
 ET · CAELIA · VENVSINA · PARENT · F · B · M · H
 SIBI · SVISQ · POSTERISQ · SVORVM ·

D(is) M(anibus). Felici, Caes(aris) n(ostri) ser(vo) vern(ae), q(ui) v(ixit) an(nis quattuordecim), mens(ibus decem), dieb(us septem), fec(erunt) M(arcus) Ulpius, Aug(usti) lib(ertus), Pacatus et Caelia Venusina parent(es) f(ilio) b(ene) m(erenti) e[t] sibi suisq(ue) posterisq(ue) suorum.

The imperial master of Felix was doubtless Trajan, the *patronus* of M. Ulpius Pacatus. The use of Venusina as a personal name is not common, but may be seen, for example, in IX, 771. For the comparatively rare use of the *ascia* on inscriptions from Rome, see note on number 24 above in the fourth article, p. 28.

73. Marble *tabula ansata*, 0,36 m. wide and 0,155 high, with the following inscription in fairly good letters :

L · FIRMIO · VITALI
 CLAVDIA · METHE
 ET · SIBI · FECIT

None of these names is rare. The most interesting is Methe (*μήθη*) which is well attested as a slave name in both Greek and Latin and recalls such suggestive names as Phiale and Dipsas,¹ though these of course do not belong to the class of abstract nouns used as personal names.

74. Block of marble 0,44 m. wide, 0,16 high, and 0,12 thick with fluting on the back which shows that it was once part of a

¹ Phiale in Iuv. 10, 238 ; Dipsas . . . ex re nomen habet, Ovid, Am., 1, 8, 2 f.

pilaster. On the front in good letters of the first or early part of the second century is the following inscription:

SOLO · DONATO · A T · FLAV
NICEROS · L|B · SIBI ·
L|BERTABVSQVE

It is evident that these lines are incomplete and that about half of the inscription is missing at the right. Under these circumstances it is of course impossible to identify this T. Flavius among the many of that name, although the generous gifts of T. Flavius Syntrophus to his freedmen, as attested in VI, 10239, at once come to mind. The more common expression to indicate a gift of ground for a tomb or monument is *locus datus* or *locus donatus*, e. g. XIV, 197 and 995.

75. Slab of marble, 0,13 m. wide and 0,515 high, in the conventional tombstone shape with rounded top and projecting points at the upper corners. It is broken horizontally into two pieces somewhat above the middle. The upper portion, which measures 0,13 m. wide by 0,20 high, bears the following inscription, fairly well cut in a style that probably does not much antedate the year 200 A. D.:

'D · M'
T · F L A V I
E V T Y C H E
'FLAVIA'
C A L L I T Y C H E
C O N I V G I · B E N E
'M E R E N T I
'F E C I T'

The genitive *Eutyche* for *Eutychae* occurs also in VI, 18059, T. Flavi Sp. f. Eutyche. The nominative appears in VIII, 5236, M. Antonius Eutycha and XIII, 6423, Eutychas disp(ensator) and the dative in XIV, 2408, L. Acilio L. f. Pompt. Eutyche.¹

¹ Dessau supplies a final syllable, thus: Eutyche[ti]; but this seems quite unnecessary.

Other forms of the name of course are common, e. g., VI, 18058, T. Flavio Eutycheti and Not. d. Scav., 1905, p. 118, T. Flavius Eutyclus. For the spelling of Callityche see above on number 67.

76. Slab of marble, 0,295 m. wide and 0,34 high, rounded at the top, with the following inscription cut in a good style of the latter part of the first century :

D · M ·
T · F L A V I O · T · F
Q V I R I N A · R Y
T H I M I A N O · F E
C I T · R Y T H Y M V S
P A T E R · A V G · L ·
V I X I T · A N N I S ·
D V O B V S · M E N S I
B V S · O C T O · D I E
B V S · D E C E M

In the fourth line a later hand attempted to change the first I to Y.


The name Rythymus, so far as my observation goes, is unattested. It seems to be derived from the Greek *ῥυθμός* with the insertion of Y which may be due to some obscure analogy. If we might assume that Rythymus is merely a graver's error for Euthymus, a possibility suggested to me in correspondence by Dr. Dessau, all difficulty would disappear. The reading on the stone, however, is perfectly clear and admits of no doubt as to what was actually written. The son of the imperial freedman was given his father's cognomen in the secondary form Rythimianus just as in IX, 1506 the *third* son of M. Cosinius Priscus was called M. Cosinius Priscianus.¹ It is worthy of remark also that he is assigned to the *tribus Quirina*, the tribe of the Flavian imperial family which originally came from the neighborhood of Reate.²

77. Slab of white marble, 0,52 m. wide and 0,45 high, with conventional molding at top and bottom, but roughly broken at the sides. It may have been the middle portion of the front of a sarcophagus, and bears the following inscription in well cut

¹ Marquardt-Mau, *Privatleben*, p. 24, n. 5.

² Suet., *Vesp.*, 1.

letters of a period not earlier than the latter part of the second century :

D	·	M	
FL · PRIMITIVA · FEC[it			
SIBI · ET · RESTITVTO · CONI[<u>u</u>			
GI · CARISIMO SVO · ET			<i>sic</i>
LIBERTIS · LIBER QVAE POS			<i>sic</i>
TERIS QVE · AEORVM			<i>sic</i>
H	·	M	
H · B · N · S ·			

The spelling CARISIMO has its parallels in VI, 20094, 21273, 29324 and elsewhere, and the substitution of AE for short open E as in LIBER(*tabus*) QVAE and AEORVM is common. The significance of B in the last line is unknown to me, unless it be merely a graver's error for E in the usual formula h(oc) m(onu-mentum) h(eredem) e(xterum) n(on) s(equetur). This stone, like number 72 above, adds one more to the comparatively small number of instances of the *ascia* found at Rome. See note on number 24 above in the fourth article, p. 28.

78. Tablet of marble from a columbarium, 0,43 m. wide and 0,13 high, with the usual nail hole at each end. The inscription, which is cut in good letters of a comparatively early period of the empire, reads as follows :

OLL · II

FLÁVIA · D · L · SALVIA ·
 PATRONO · DAT · OLLA · T · D · S · P
 D · FLÁVIVS · D · L · BARNAEVS

These cognomina are not very common but Salvia is, for example, the cognomen of a freedwoman in VI, 25842 and Ephem. Epig. VIII, p. 135, n. 529 and Salvius of a freedman ib., p. 129, n. 503. Barnaeus, too, occurs in V, 8905 and in Cicero, Att. xiv, 19, 1. For the usual *ollam dat* we find *dat olla(m)* not rarely used, as in VI, 3994, Gemina l. Augustae | ornatrix | Irene l. suae dat olla. Similarly ib. 3936, 4094, 4265. *Dat ollam* on the other hand appears ib. 3967, 4012, 4107, and *dat oll(am)*, ib.

4065, 4102, 4236. The initial letters in the second line probably signify t(itulum) d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia).

79. Thin tablet of marble, 0,205 m. wide and 0,105 high, with the following inscription carefully cut between guiding lines scratched on the surface :

GARGONIA · C · L

ANOTALE

sic

H · S · E

On the other side of the tablet, cut less carefully but apparently by the same hand, stands the same inscription with the misspelling corrected and the separative points in the last line omitted :

GARGONIA · C · L ·

ANATOLE

H S E

The immediate discovery of his error seems to have led the graver to reverse the stone and repeat the inscription. The names are rather uncommon, though well attested in the inscriptions. For example, we find Gargonia Valentina in VI, 18886, Aelia Anatole ib. 11607 and Licinia O. l. Anatole in Not. d. Scav., 1900, p. 579.

80. Tablet of marble, 0,32 m. wide and 0,20 high, inscribed with good letters of the early imperial period. An incised conventional pattern surrounds the text, which reads as follows :

D | S · M A N I B V S

L · G E L L I · F E L I C I S

V A L E R I A · O N O M A S T E

V I R O · S V O E T · S I B I

P O S T E R I S Q · S V I S · F E C I T

The third line was erased in antiquity but not so completely as to make decipherment impossible. Another L. Gellius Felix appears in VI, 18964 and Onomaste as a cognomen of freedwomen is fairly common, e. g., XIV, 1233, 3774 and 3832, Rubellia L. l. Onomaste.

81. Slab of white marble from outside the Porta Salaria, 0,25 m. wide and 0,345 high, broken into two parts by a violent blow, doubtless of a workman's pickaxe. The stone is roughly broken also at the bottom. The inscription, which is cut in small but well made letters, reads as follows :

P . GRATTIVS . SP . F
COL . CELER
H|C . EGO NVNC . IACEO . GRATTIVS
INFELIX . SVB . TEGMINE . TERRAE
5 ~~BARBA~~ . DEPOSITA . PER AGENS
TERTIVM . ET . V|CENSIMVM . ANNVM
INFELIX . INDIGNE . SVBIECTVS
ACERBE . MORTE . NEFANDA
OCC|SVS . CALCE . ET . MANIBVS . EXTRA
10 FATVM . PROTRVSVS . IN HAS . TENEBRAS
HOC . OPTO . MORIARE . MAL|S . EX
EMPL|S . CRVCIATVS . ET . IPSE
NEC . TE NVNC . LICEAT . QVO . ME
PR|VAST| . LVMEN . VIDERE
15 ET . TV . DES . POENAS . QVAS . MERVISTI
DEFENSVS . IN|QVE
VOS . NVNC . CONSO

This text was first published in Not. d. Scav., 1900, p. 578, by Gatti, whose copy varies from the stone only in its omission of four separative points and in its failure to record seven of the eight examples of the *I longa*. These errors, however, were for the most part corrected in Bull. Com., 1901, p. 103. Two other inscriptions from the same region seem to show that a *collegium funeraticium* was organized in the *familia* of P. Grattius: Bull. Com., 1902, p. 88, n. 4, P. Gratt[ius] P. l. Heracl[a], | mag(ister) de[sign(atus)] and ib. 1901, p. 103, P. Gr[attius] P. l.] | Dio [omnibus] | honoribu[s f]unct(us) | in familia. Our P. Grattius Celer, like illegitimate sons generally, is assigned to the *tribus Collina*, the least honorable of the four city tribes.

The most interesting feature of this inscription is the fact that it is made up almost entirely of the *disiecta membra* of poetry, stray snatches of verse, most of which are mere commonplaces of the epitaph, while others recall with more or less force passages

from classical authors. Slight changes and occasional omissions would transform this chaos into hexameters which are at least as good as the average verses found in the *Carmina Epigraphica*:

Hic ego nunc iaceo infelix sub tegmine terrae,
Barba deposita, peragens vicensimum | annum,
Indigne subiectus, acerbe morte nefanda
Occisus, calce et manibus protrusus in — .
Hoc opto moriari malis cruciatus et ipse
Exemplis.
Nec te nunc liceat quo me — — ∪ videre.
Et tu des poenas quas — defensu inique.
Vos nunc conso[lor].

To the popular mind even rhythmical phrases and unfinished or imperfect verses made their irresistible appeal and it is by no means unusual to find in the epitaphs the metrical form of a line as a whole utterly shattered by the introduction of a name or the change of a number. For example, VIII, 10828 has in iambic senarius quae dum per annos bis XVIII vita gerit, where *decem* was changed to XVIII to suit a new occasion. Similarly in a pentameter X, 5020 we read In sexto et decem ascendens deposui hanc animam, where *et decem* is superfluous. The strange state of mind indicated by these phenomena has its parallel in modern times also as the following clipping from the memorial column of a recent newspaper shows:

God alone knows how we miss thee
In our home, O daughter and sister dear,
How for thee our hearts are yearning,
How we long thy praise to hear.
By her Mother and Sisters.

To throw light on the method of such compositions a few comments and parallels are added. Their number could be greatly increased by a careful reading of Buecheler's *Carmina Epigraphica* or even by a perusal of the pages of Lier and Tolman.¹

Line 3. *Hic ego nunc iaceo*: B(uecheler) 373, 3, hic ego nunc iac(eo); ib. 389, 3, hic ego secure iaceo; 399, Florus ego hic iaceo; ib. 496, hic iaceo infelix; cf. Ovid, *Trist.* iii, 1, 73, hic ego qui iaceo.

¹ B. Lier, *Topica carminum sepulcralium Latinorum*, in *Philologus*, 1903, pp. 445 and 563; ib. 1904, p. 54. J. A. Tolman, *A Study of the Sepulchral Inscriptions in Buecheler's Carmina Epigraphica Latina*. Chicago, 1910.

Line 4. *sub tegmine terrae*: Verg. Ecl. 1, 1, sub tegmine fagi; cf. B. 400, 6, at quamvis te terra tegat, and n. 48 above (at end).

Line 5-6. *Peragens...annum*: B. 588, 3, ter senis misero et quattuor paene peractis annis.

Line 7. *Indigne*: B. 1007, 2, indigne raptus; ib. 619, hostibus indigne saeva n[unc morte peremptus] dunc cupit infelix flammās [inferre].

Line 9. *Calce et manibus*: Plaut. Poen. 819, incursat pugnīs, calcibus; Cic. Verr. iii, 56, cum pugnīs et calcibus concisus esset.

Line 10. *Protrusus in has tenebras*: Phaed. V, 7, 39, capite est protrusus foras; Stat. Theb. ii, 25, has . . . tenebras (in the same sense).

Line 11-12. *Hoc opto*: compare VI, 36467, opto ei, ut cum | dolore corporis | longo tempore vivat | et cum mortuus fue|rit inferi eum non | recipiant. The awful nature of the curse reminds one of the *defixiones*. The same construction is seen in B. 1191, 9, optamus dulce quiesc[ant]. Parallels for the colloquial *malis exemplis cruciatus* abound in Plautus and elsewhere.

Line 14. *Privasti (lumine)*: Macrob. III, 9, 10, lumine supero privetis; B. 445, 5, hanc annus.x privavit munere lucis; ib. 651, pribatus luci; ib. 516, 7, luce privata; ib. 398, 2, caruit luce; ib. 514, 2, fraudatus luce. For other similar expressions, see Tolman, l. c., p. 41. With *lumen videre* compare B. 392, cernere lucem; ib. 474, 8, lucē(m) videre.

Line 16. *Defensus inique*: Iuv. x, 85, male defensus.

The rest of the sepulchral inscriptions will form the basis of the next paper.

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

III.—HIATUS IN THE ACCENTUAL CLAUSULAE OF BYZANTINE GREEK PROSE.

The treatment of hiatus in the rhythmical prose of Byzantine Greek writers is a matter which can be thoroughly tested by the law of the rhythm known as Meyer's Law. Such a test yields a result which is surprising in itself, and at the same time throws an interesting light on the manner in which the literary language of Athens was treated by men of letters after the third century of our era.

The attitude of the writers of classical times in this matter, both poets and prose writers, is well understood; hiatus was a thing to be avoided, and was tolerated only within certain narrow limits. The most careful writers of prose held to as rigid a rule as that which obtained in poetry, and a small number of cases of hiatus is always testimony to the *limae labor*. It was only natural, therefore, that those who, in later centuries, strove to follow in the footsteps of the best writers of classical times, should have carefully observed this well-established rule. In Byzantine times the tradition was one well-known to all, especially those who sought to reproduce the form and spirit of the old Attic. And indeed no more than a cursory perusal of such writers is required to convince one that the masterpieces of the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ were the models in this respect, as in many others.

But here we are concerned with a very definite question, which is not settled by the admission of the general proposition that hiatus was avoided on principle by careful writers of Byzantine times. The question is now limited to *clausulae*, and so has to do only with a few words in each clause—those words, namely, on which the writer expended particular care in order to obtain a definite closing cadence. Further it is proposed to discover not only how often hiatus occurs in this position, but also what kinds of hiatus are allowed.

The rhythmical prose with which we have to deal offers a situation which is, in general, extremely simple. We have a

rule that either two or four syllables without stress may intervene between the last two spoken accents of every colon and comma; other combinations are excluded. Manifestly a clausula of such simple structure, measured by a mechanical count of the syllables, will generally show at a glance whether the rhythmic structure allows hiatus to stand, or requires that it be avoided by elision, aphaeresis or crasis.

Since the question which has been raised cannot be settled by an appeal to the usage of any single writer, it has been found necessary to gather evidence from writing of as many different kinds as possible, and from writers of different interests and different training, in order to make general conclusions safe. With this in view eight writers of the fourth and fifth centuries A. D. have been examined, and an attempt made to gather together all cases which can have any possible bearing on the question. All clausulae, both at slight sense pauses and at the ends of periods, have been included. This method has introduced a possibility of error, since it is often well nigh impossible to discover just where the minor sense pauses in a sentence occur, but fortunately the rhythmic structure gives much assistance in locating the clausulae. It has been thought safest to begin with writers whose clausulae show approximate regularity throughout, and thereafter to see what can be done with the writing of others, who did not reach such mechanical perfection of style. In order not to weary the reader with a long array of examples, only those cases will be taken into account at all where the evidence is perfectly clear; within each group examples will suffice to illustrate what is included in the different subdivisions.

Remark 1. The method of counting clausulae before all sense pauses brings into the count many clausulae which are not generally marked by punctuation; clausulae have been sought at the end of participial phrases and at the end of clauses followed by a coordinate clause introduced by *καί*. This principle has been followed in all the writers presented in the following discussion.

Remark 2. It must be remembered that in all cases the figures giving totals of regular and irregular Forms are based on a reading of the text exactly as it stands in the edition used in each case; many an irregularity would disappear if the manuscripts of the rhythmical prose writers should be reconsidered in

the light of the rhythmical law. This may be said to apply in particular to the works of the Church Fathers, whose writings have, in most cases, found no editor since the time of the "Patrologia Graeca". On the other hand the clausulae presented below are *not* printed in every case as they stand in the editions used; elisions, etc., are indicated or omitted without regard to the manuscript tradition, which can have no bearing on the matter; the clausulae are so printed as to be read as regular Forms as they stand.

I. PROCOPIUS OF GAZA.

The works of Procopius comprise a collection of Epistles written in a careful literary style.¹ In Epistles I-CI (omitting XLIX, which is addressed to Procopius), the accentual rhythm is found to be used with considerable regularity. Counting the clausulae at all sense pauses, only 11 per cent. of the total number (2088) are found which do not conform to the regular Forms which are designated as Form 2 (˘ ~ ~ ˘ [~ ~]) and Form 4 (˘ ~ ~ ~ ~ ˘ [~ ~]).

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 47.

Elision demanded, ² 23.		Elision impossible, 12.	
τε	ο	1	λέγειν εἴτε δνόματα, ⁴ XCII.
δέ	2 e. g. νῦν δ' ἰσως φίλοι. ³ LXX.	6 e. g. ἤκουε δὲ οὐδέν. LXXX.	
Prep.	20 e. g. βούλομαι δι' ὑμῶν. LXXXII.	1	ταῦτα παρὰ ὑμῖν, XCII.
Others	1	4 e. g. ἐμηχανήσαντο ἄνθρωποι, LIII.	
Doubtful, 12.			

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 12. Evidence *for* elision, 23-12; (but of the 23 cases note that 20 involve prepositions).

¹ Ed. Hercher: Epistolographi Graeci.

² Sc. by the rhythm.

³ The marks of punctuation, if any, found in the text used will be kept in each case; in cases where these are lacking, it will be understood that the pauses were not regarded by the editor of the text as distinct enough to justify any punctuation.

⁴ This case presents a situation which comes up repeatedly. The clausula may be read as Form 2 or Form 4, according as the stress on *εἴτε* is regarded as sufficient to stand out as the opening stress of the clausula or not. For our present inquiry this question makes no difference, for in either case the necessity of elision is not affected.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable,¹ 58.

Elision demanded, 5.	Mov. cons. must be retained, 49.
ε 1 ἤχ' ὁ Στρατήγιος, XC.	24 e. g. ἐπῆλθεν ἐκεῖνος. LXVI.
ι 4 e. g. κατὰ νοῦν ἐστ' ἄνθρωποις, CI.	25 e. g. ὑποπτεύουσιν ἄνθρωποι· XC.
Doubtful, 4.	

Result: 49-5 in favor of ν movable as against elision.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis,² 35.

Crisis demanded, 6.	Crisis impossible, 26.
Article 3 e. g. ἐμμήσατο τούνομα, LXXXII.	14 e. g. ἐτους αἱ ὥραι, LXXX.
καί 3 e. g. πάντως κἀγώ. LXXXIV.	12 e. g. ἐστηκός καὶ ἀκίνητον. LXXV.

To these should be added two cases involving the second personal reflexive:

οἶμαι σαντῶ, LXIII.
παρέχεις σαντόν, LXXXVI.

One case involving the third personal reflexive seems to give its testimony in favor of crasis: λογισμὸν ἐφ' αὐτόν, XV. Here the only escape from reading with crasis is λογισμὸν ἐπὶ ἑαυτόν, but it has been seen above that the elision of the final vowels of prepositions is far more common than the opposite procedure, and the probability is decidedly in favor of the former reading with crasis.

One more case must be added: οὐκ ἀνέξομαι μὴ οὐ λαμπρὸς εἶναι LXXXV. The clausula is probably μὴ οὐ λαμπρὸς εἶναι (— | ~ | ~ — | ~ ~), but there is a possibility of ἀνέξομαι μὴ οὐ λαμπρὸς εἶναι (— ~ ~ | ~ | ~ — | ~ ~), with synizesis.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 26. Evidence against crasis, 28-7.

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 1.

Crisis impossible: ἐμαντοῦ ἐπιλέλθωμαι. XCV.

Group V. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 3.

ἀρχουσι πρὸς ὑμῶν, LXXXII.
ἐμαντοῦ ἡνιάθην, LXXXVII.
πάντως περὶ ἡμῶν. LXXII.

Summary: in all groups together 42 clear cases of genuine

¹ Such cases are taken into account in connection with the question of elision, because there was always the possibility of eliding the short vowel instead of covering it by the movable consonant.

² It has been assumed for purposes of definiteness that an initial vowel or diphthong can suffer crasis with any form of the article not ending in a consonant, or with καί. When other possible cases are observed, they will be noted separately.

hiatus are found, 2.01 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 2088.

II. CHORICIUS OF GAZA.

In the case of Choricus, one of the pupils of Procopius of Gaza, the text of some of his writings may be read in a modern critical edition.¹ The question of hiatus in this writer has been treated exhaustively by C. Kirsten (*Quaestiones Choricianae*, Bres. Phil. Abh. VII (1895), pp. 25-35), but his treatment is mechanical and the evidence of the rhythm is not brought to bear. His labor seems to have been confined to gathering all cases of written hiatus; for example *μάλιστα εἶναι* (p. 27) is given as a bona fide example of hiatus, without mention of the possibility of elision. For this reason and because the present article has to do only with hiatus in clausulae his results have no bearing on this discussion. From the four orations read² it is clear that Choricus was an extremely careful stylist. The regularity of the rhythm is surprising: among the total of 1563 clausulae counted only 74 (4.7 + %) do not conform to the two regular Forms.

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 14.

Elision demanded, 1.		Elision impossible, 12.	
τε	ο	1	αὶ φῆμαί τε ᾄδουσι Epi. Zach. 12.
δέ	ο	2	e. g. ἀδυνάτως δὲ ἔχων Lyd. 38.
Others 1 ἐγὼ δέ σ' ἡξίου Lyd. 5.		9	e. g. ταῦτα ἀκούσας Mil. 52.
Doubtful, 1.			

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 12. Evidence against elision, 12-1.

Note. It is to be observed that only two of these 13 clausulae stand before distinct sense pauses: *ἀνεδήσατο ἄθλον*. Epi. Zach. 7 and *φιλότητα εἶναι*, Epi. Zach. 7. In neither of these two cases is elision possible.

Group II. Cases involving ♪ movable, 35.

Elision demanded, 1.		Mov. cons. must be retained, 30.	
ε ο		17	e. g. ἐμήνυσεν ἡκεῖν, Lyd. 1.
ι ι	περιττός ἐστ' ὁ λόγος Epi. Zach. 11.	13	e. g. φέρουσιν ἀκοαί, Epi. Proc. 38.
Doubtful, 4.			

Result: 30-1 in favor of ♪ movable as against elision.

¹ Ed. Richard Foerster: *Index lectionum in universitate litterarum Vratislaviensi* 1891, 1892, 1893.

² Epithalamium to Zacharias; Epithalamium to Procopius, Johannes and Elias; The Lydians; Miltiades.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 19.

Crisis demanded, 1.

Crisis impossible, 15.

Article 1 ἀρπάσσεται θῶπλα; Mil. 88. 15 e. g. κέκληται τῷ ὀνόματι, Epi. Zach. 15.
Doubtful, 1.

To these may be added the following:

For crisis, βιάσασθαι γοῦν¹ προσήκει, Lyd. 26.

Against crisis ἐγὼ οὖν τὴν νύμφην, Epi. Zach. 15.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 16. Evidence against crasis, 16-2.

Group IV. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 6 (all Form 2), e. g.

παρέχει ἰχθῦς, Epi. Proc. 36.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 44 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 2.81 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 1563.

III. JOHN ELEEMON.

Two publications of comparatively recent years have given us critical editions of two works, both hagiographical, in which the accentual rhythm has been carefully regarded in editing the text. The one is the Life of St. Tychon by John Eleemon (ed. Usener: Der Heilige Tychon, 1907); the other is an Encomium on St. Therapon by an anonymous writer (ed. Deubner: De Incubatione, 1900). In the Life of St. Tychon, the rhythm is remarkable in that Form 2 alone is used in 89.8 + % of all clausulae; the other type of clausula commonly regarded as regular (Form 4) occurs in only 5. + % of the clausulae,² while the (commonly) irregular Form 3 occurs in 4. + % of all cases. This makes it exceedingly probable that only Form 2 is here strictly regular; the common use of this Form together with the almost constant use of a final accentual dactyl are the essential factors of the rhythm. I have not attached as much importance to the final dactyl as did the editor, and have accordingly counted some clausulae which are not so indicated in the printing.³ Considering the nature of the rhythm, we can use with confidence only those cases which involve Form 2.

¹ γοῦν had become practically an independent word, and the case proves little for elision or crasis in general.

² Even some of those which are apparently Form 4 can be read as Form 2, e. g. πάντως εἶναι φιλόανθρωπος,—2, 18-19.

³ On the other hand I have disregarded some of the editor's clausulae, on the ground that the sense pause is too weak to allow us to *expect* a clausula.

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 10.

Elision demanded, 2.

δέ 2 e. g. μυρία δ' ἀκήκοε—¹ 4, 14.

Others 0

Doubtful, 5.

Elision impossible, 3.

0

3 e. g. αἰτήματα ἔλαβον,—21, 11.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 3. Evidence against elision, 3-2.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 26. No case favors elision as against ν movable; 19 must certainly be kept as they stand.

After ε 12 ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελον.—10, 1.

“ ι 7 εὐρήκασιν ἀπαντας—17, 23.

Doubtful, 7.

Result: 19-0 in favor of ν movable as against elision.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 58.

Crisis demanded, 4.

Article 1 ἐκδιδύσκει θαιμάτια—1, 9-10. 14 e. g. ἐκτίνει τὸ δόγμα, —14, 16.

καί 2 e. g. χαμερπῶς κατελῶς, 38, 7. 22 e. g. ξηρόν τε καὶ ἀνικμον—10, 17.

πρό 1 μέλλοντα προύλεγεν. 10, 27. 0

Doubtful, 18.

Crisis impossible, 36.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 36. Evidence against crasis, 36-4.²

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 1.

λόγω μὴ ἔφερεν,—8, 28. The hiatus is to be kept.

Group V. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 3.

ἀκερδῆς ἢ ἀνόητος—8, 9-10.

ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχουσι—22, 19.

ἐκδυσάμενοι αὐτήν—³ 26, 1.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 42 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 3.1 + 1/2 of the total number of clausulae read, 1316.

IV. ANONYMOUS ENCOMIUM ON ST. THERAPON.

The rhythm is here (again) of the common sort which recognizes two regular Forms of clausulae, and is remarkably regular.

¹ Clausulae followed by a dash are printed as clausulae by the editor, others not. Punctuation, if found in the text, is given in each case.

² Eleven cases involving crasis were found printed as clausulae by the editor, but omitted from this discussion as noted above (p. 193, n. 3); they add nothing to the evidence here given.

³ The order of these words must be reversed, as suggested by Usener, in order to read a correct clausula.

Number of clausulae read, 645; Form 2, 487 (75.5 + %); Form 4, 127 (19.6 + %); non-conforming, 31 (4.8 + %).¹

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 14.

Elision demanded, 3.	Elision impossible, 10.
Prep. 1 τὸ σῶμα δι' ἔλεον.— ² 23, 9.	0
Others 2 e. g. ὄνομ' ὑμῶν. ³ 10, 1-2.	10 e. g. ταῦτα ὅστ' α, 7, 15.
Doubtful, 1.	

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 10. Evidence against elision, 10-3.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 11.

Elision demanded, 0.	Mov. cons. must be retained, 9.
	ε εἶχεν ἐτέρα 17, 9.
	ι τοῖς ἱστοροῦσιν ἐνδίδωσι—1, 5-6.
Doubtful, 2.	

Result: 9-0 in favor of ν movable as against elision.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 28.

Crasis demanded, 1.	Crasis impossible, 25.
Article 1 . . . Φλωρίνος δὲ τοῦνομα,— ⁴ 12, 2.	17 e. g. προτρέχει τὸ ἔλεος,—23, 14.
καί 0	8 e. g. σώματά τε καὶ αἵματα,—4, 6-7.
Doubtful, 2.	

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 25. Evidence against crasis, 25-1.

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 7.

Aphaeresis demanded, 0.	Aphaeresis impossible, 7, e. g.
	ψιθυρισμοῦ ἐπακούοντα.—25, 13-14.
	ἐκ μέσου ἐγένετο.—20, 7.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 7. Evidence against aphaeresis, 7-0.

Group V. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 8, e. g.

Form 2 . . . ἐλαίῳ ἀλείφθητι.—16, 9.
Form 4 . . . ποιμένος μὴ ἀποδράμοι [τε]—27, 14.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 50 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 7.7 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 645.⁵

¹ The editor's division into commata has been departed from on the same principle as in the Life of St. Tychon (p. 193, n. 3).

² The use of the dash is the same as in the preceding presentation.

³ The words are an adaptation of biblical language, ὄνομα σου, LXX, Cant. I 3.

⁴ Cf. Μαρία τὸ ὄνομα,—17, 9.

⁵ Among 12 clausulae which are omitted on the grounds stated above, only one deserves special notice, as showing a clear case of crasis:

τέλος εἰς τοῦδαφος—12, 15.

V. ARISTAENETUS.

The accentual rhythm is very plainly present in the Erotic Epistles of this writer.¹ All the letters in the collection of Hercher have been included in this test; among 2297 clausulae counted there are found 1260 (54.8 + %) of Form 2, 647 (28.1 + %) of Form 4, and 378 (16.9 + %) non-conforming clausulae.²

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 67.

	Elision demanded, 30.	Elision impossible, 28.
τε	3 e. g. ἐφίλουν θ' ἡδέως, II, 16.	1 οἶα τε ἦν, I, 6.
δέ	4 e. g. ἀγριότητα δ' ἐξορίζων. I, 15.	11 e. g. σχηματιζόμενος δὲ ὑπὸ- κρισιν II, 3.
Prep.	14 e. g. τὰ δρώμενα παρ' ἐκείνης, II, 18.	2 e. g. ἡράσθης ἀπὸ ὧν λέγεις, II, 17.
Others	9 e. g. ὦ μέλισσ' ἐμή, II, 21.	14 e. g. εἰκός γε, ὦ φίλτατε. I, 22.
	Doubtful, 9.	

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 28. Evidence *for* elision, 30-28.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 89.

	Elision demanded, 14.	Mov. cons. must be retained, 69.
ε	10 e. g. πέφυχ' ἱππότης. I, 8.	41 e. g. ἀπέσωσεν εἰσδραμοῦσα. I, 5.
ι	4 e. g. ἐρωτός ἐστ' ἀρχή. II, 12.	28 e. g. μειονεκτοῦσιν αἱ κόραι. I, 10.
	Doubtful, 6.	

Result: 69-14 in favor of ν movable as against elision.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 49.

	Crasis demanded, 11.	Crasis impossible, 31.
Article	2 e. g. ἐβόμβει σοι τῶτα, II, 13.	23 e. g. πέπανται μὲν τὰ ἀνθη II, 1.
καί	9 e. g. νέος κάρωτικός I, 25.	8 e. g. ἀφ᾽ καὶ ἀνέλη. I, 10.
	Doubtful, 7.	

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 31. Evidence against crasis, 31-11.

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 4.

	Aphaeresis demanded, 2.	Aphaeresis impossible, 2.
	οὐ μέντοι ᾽ς ὑπερηφάνειαν, ³ I, 11.	ἐπισιτίσασθαι τι ἐκεῖθεν. I, 3.
	ὀμφακίζει, ᾽μπεδόκλεις, ⁴ II, 7.	πάνυ ἐπαγωγόν. I, 1.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 2. Evidence as to aphaeresis, neutral.

¹ Ed. Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci*.

² Of this number 10.3 + % are of Form 3, which is in general the most frequent of the irregular Forms.

³ This case is complicated by the possibility of ὑπερηφάνειαν.

⁴ i. e. ᾽Εμπεδόκλεις.

Group V. Hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 8, e. g.

Form 2 . . . στέρνῳ ἀρμόζοντες, II, 19.

Form 4 . . . εἶη μοι Ἀφροδίτη. II, 13.

Note. Four cases of this sort occurring in non-conforming clausulae are excluded from the list of certain cases of hiatus.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 69 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 3.00 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 2297.

VI. ZOSIMUS.

The first and fourth books of the History (Corp. Scr. Hist. Byz.) have been used; within these books 3487 clausulae were found, distributed as follows: Form 2, 1735 (49.7 + %); Form 4, 1141 (32.7 + %); non-conforming clausulae, 611 (17.5 + %).¹

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 91.

Elision demanded, 22.

Elision impossible, 51.

τε 6 e. g. δπλα τ' ἀνέλαβον, 234, 6.²

12 e. g. ἔργου τε ἀπτεσθαι 219, 14-15.

δέ 5 e. g. παιδαγωγῆσαι δ' ὀλίγους 198, 12.

8 e. g. ἦννε δὲ οὐδέν· 238, 7.

Prep. 6 e. g. ἐκπέμπειν ἀνθ' ἑαυτῶν, 209, 4.

3 e. g. ἀνεχώρησαν ἐπὶ οἴκου. 30, 17.

Others 5 e. g. ἤγετ' εἰς κρίσιν, 236, 24.

28 e. g. τότε ἡ Ῥώμη 43, 11.

Doubtful, 18.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 51. Evidence against elision, 51-22.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 92.

Elision demanded, 6.

Mov. cons. must be retained, 73.

ε 2 e. g. γέγον' ἐλείν, 59, 6.

27 e. g. ἔδοξεν εἶναι· 231, 10.

ι 4 e. g. γράμμασ' ἐχρήτο, 238, 17.

46 e. g. πόλεσιν ἐπιόντων, 200, 21.

Doubtful, 13.

Result: evidence in favor of ν movable as against elision, 73-6.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 42.

Crasis demanded, 8.

Crasis impossible, 20.

Article 3 e. g. περιέπλει τάκεισε, 230, 7.

11 e. g. τὸ δραστήριον τοῦ ἀνδρός, 237, 4.

καί 4 e. g. πεζῶν τε χίππέων, 41, 15.

9 e. g. χεῖρα καὶ ἐπληξεν. 236, 1.

πρό 1 τοῦτο προύχωρησεν, 227, 8-9.

0

Doubtful, 14.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 20. Evidence against crasis, 20-8.

¹ Among these Form 3 has the greatest single percentage, 7.4 + %.

² References are to page and line in the Corpus.

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 6.

Aphaeresis demanded, 0.

Aphaeresis impossible, 2.

τύχης ἢ ἐκ προνοίας, 60, 22.

Doubtful, 4.

εὐθὺ εἰς φυγὴν· 46, 1.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 2. Evidence against aphaeresis, 2-0.

Group V. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 7.

Form 2, 3 e. g. ἑώρα δκνοῦντας 222, 4.

Form 4, 1 ἀπολούμενοι ὀρχησται, 212, 3.

Irregular, 3.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 74 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 2.12 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 3487.

VII. SYNESIUS.

The text of Epistles I-XLV has been read in Hercher's *Epistolographi Graeci*. Among the 1171 clausulae found in this space the regular Forms 2 and 4 occur as follows: Form 2, 647 times (55.2 + %), Form 4, 255 times (21.7 + %); the non-conforming clausulae amount to 269 (22.5 + %).¹

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 67.

Elision demanded, 17.

Elision impossible, 27.

τε 3 e. g. αὐταί τ' ἐσκευάζοντο 163 B.

1 προήγαγόν τε αὐτόν, 174 A.

δέ 4 e. g. σχετλιαζόντων δ' ἡμῶν 161 A.

9 e. g. ἐγκλημα δὲ ὑμῖν, 172 B.

Prep. 7 e. g. ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλῳ 166 A.

0

Others 3 e. g. ἔχοιμ' ἂν ὑπομνήματα. 167 A.

17 e. g. τὸν ἄνδρα ἡμίγυνον, 184 D.

Doubtful, 23.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 27. Evidence against elision, 27-17.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 32.

Elision demanded, 4.

Mov. cons. must be retained, 16.

ε 3 e. g. ἀπέλιφ' ἡμᾶς, 164 B.

6 e. g. οἶδεν ἡ Δίκη. 185 D.

ι 1 ὁρῶσ' ἅπερ ἐστι,² 157 D.

10 e. g. σπάταλός ἐστιν οὗτος. 185 B.

Doubtful, 12.

Result: evidence for ν movable as against elision, 16-4.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 29.

Crisis demanded, 9.

Crisis impossible, 17.

Article 5 e. g. ἡπίστατο τάληθές 184 B.

4 e. g. ἐξετάζειν τὰ ἐκγονα· 157 D.

καί 4 e. g. αὐτοῦ τε κάμου. 185 B.

13 e. g. γίνονται καὶ εὐμήχανοι. 184 D.

Doubtful, 3.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 17. Evidence against crisis, 17-9.

¹ One half of all these cases are of Form 3 (11.0 + %). ² ἅπερ without stress.

Group IV. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 7.

Form 2, 6 e. g. τοῦ μὴ ἁμαρτεῖν, 184 A.

Not regular, 1.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 50 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 4.26 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 1171.

VIII. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS.

Oratio IV, Contra Iulianum, has been used for this test;¹ among 2105 clausulae found in this oration 1190 (42.3 + %) conform to Form 2, 848 (30.2 + %) to Form 4, while 769 (27.2 + %) are non-conforming clausulae.² The rhythm is therefore unusually irregular, but is present without a possibility of a doubt: the testimony of the rhythmical law will, as usual, be rigidly followed in the following presentation.

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 136.

	Elision demanded, 45.	Elision impossible, 45.
τε	4 e. g. λέγειν θ' ὁμοῦ, LXXXIV.	8 e. g. ἡλιός τε ἰστάμενος, XIX.
δέ	5 e. g. πολλοῖς οὐδ' ἐγένετο· CXXIII.	15 e. g. ἀποκηρύττω δὲ ὅμως, XI.
Prep.	21 e. g. κίνησιν ἐπ' αὐτόν, LXXXVIII.	3 e. g. ἡ αὐτὴ κατὰ ὑμᾶς Ἡρα, CXVI.
	Others 15 e. g. ἡνίκ' ἐπλατύνθημεν, XXXII.	19 e. g. ἀποστερεῖτε ἡμᾶς, CV.
	Doubtful, 46.	

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 45. Evidence regarding elision, neutral.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 38.

	Elision demanded, 3.	Mov. cons. must be retained, 27.
ε ι	παρελύπησ' ἡμᾶς, XXXVII.	9 e. g. ἐπραττεν ἤδη, XCV.
ι 2	e. g. τοῖς δαίμοσ' ἐπιφημίζοντες· XLVII.	18 e. g. χρήμασιν ἀφιέμενος; CXVI.
	Doubtful, 8.	

Result: 27-3 in favor of ν movable as against elision.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 166.

	Crasis demanded, 20.	Crasis impossible, 111.
Article	15 e. g. ὑπεραλγῶν τὰδελεφού, XLV.	33 e. g. καθιέρωσις ἡ ἐπίδοσις· XXV.
καί	4 e. g. θαυμασίου κἀρεθουσίων, ³ LXXXVIII.	74 e. g. θεολογικὰς τε καὶ ἠθικὰς. CXV.
πρό	1 νόμους προῦβάλλετο, XCIII.	4 e. g. μιᾶς προεβάλλετο, XCIV.
	Doubtful, 35.	

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 111. Evidence against crasis, 111-20.

¹ Migne, Patrologia Graeca, 35.

² The greatest single percentage of non-conforming clausulae is in Form 1 (10.7 + %).

³ i. e. καὶ Ἀρεθουσίων.

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 3.

Aphaeresis demanded, 0.

Aphaeresis impossible, 1.

συστελλούση εἰς τὸ τριβώνιον. LXXII.

Doubtful, 2.

Result: one clear case of genuine hiatus. Evidence against aphaeresis, 1-0.

Group V. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 23, e. g.

Form 2 *οὐ πολὺ πρὸς ἡμῶν*, LXXII.Form 4 *διανοεῖται περὶ ἡμῶν*, LXI.

Irregular or doubtful, 7.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 174 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 6.89 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 2105.

CONCLUSION.

In looking over the situation in these eight writers, it becomes immediately evident that their attitude towards hiatus was a strange one indeed from the point of view of classical usage. That they knew the traditional rule regarding the avoidance of hiatus, and conscientiously tried to follow it cannot be a matter of doubt.¹ But their conception of hiatus itself must have been an entirely different one from that which was current in the time when Attic was a spoken as well as a literary language. In the earlier time hiatus had meant not merely the juxtaposition of two vowel sounds between successive words, but the unavoidable juxtaposition of such sounds. When the language was spoken there was no hiatus where it could be avoided by elision, crasis, aphaeresis or a movable consonant. Accordingly there was no genuine hiatus in such a phrase as *Κῦρος δὲ ἦλθεν*, except as a matter of writing; the sound of the phrase was *Κῦρος δ' ἦλθεν*, irrespective of the manner of writing.² Similarly in cases where crasis or aphaeresis might prevent the clash of vowels, there was no hiatus in the reading or speaking of the words. We may not be able to say exactly in every case whether elision, crasis or aphaeresis are permissible, but we may be sure that they were regularly introduced when the situation justified their use.

¹ Cf., in the case of one writer, Kirsten, *Quaest. Chor.*, pp. 25-35.

² There is abundant evidence in classical inscriptions to show that the indication of elision in writing prose and poetry as well was largely a matter of chance. Cf. Meisterhans, *Gram. der Att. Inschriften*, §§ 24, 25.

This narrows down the number of genuine cases of hiatus to a very small number, namely those cases in which the vowels retain their own individuality in speaking, not being affected by any of the processes of combination or elimination. Such a criterion might logically be followed in the printing of all our classical Greek prose, as has been done in the case of Demosthenes by Friedrich Blass. This method certainly has the merit of consistency, and, if the Greek is to look as it sounded, there is no escape from it.

Each and every one, therefore, of these Byzantine writers is found repeatedly allowing hiatus to be read as such in cases where genuine hiatus would be inconceivable to an Athenian of Demosthenes' time. For it must be remembered that the accentual rhythm depended for its effect upon its sound, whether it was used to adorn a public oration or a historical narrative. On the other hand, the legitimate remedy for such cases is not always disregarded, for elision and crasis are found in clausulae not infrequently. The situation seems unreasonable at first glance—in fact impossible. A doubt may arise as to whether we can allow the evidence of the rhythm alone to drive us to such a conclusion. A few striking examples may show to what we are forced.

Φλωρίνος δὲ τοῦνομα (Therap. 12, 2).

ἀπαγγεῖλαι δ' οὐ ῥᾶδιον (Aris. II, 4).

χαμερπῶς κάτελῶς (Tych. 38, 7).

δύνασθαι παρ' ὑμῖν (Proc. Ep. 14).

ἀρπάσσεται θῶπλα (Chor. Mil. 88).

νόμους προῦβάλλετο (Greg. Naz. Jul. 93).

cf. Μαρία τὸ ὄνομα (id. 17, 9).

“λήξω δὲ δμως (id. I, 1).

“ἄμα καὶ ἀλαλον (id. 35, 10).

“ταῦτα παρὰ ὑμῖν (id. 92).

“καταθεμένους τὰ ὄπλα, (id. 5, 6).

“μᾶς προεβάλλετο (id. 94).

If the evidence of the rhythmical law is to be followed, we meet with such inconsistencies at every turn. There is one escape—namely to treat the cases in question by the standards of classical usage, and consider every clausula which on this principle does not comply with the accentual law as one of the non-conforming clausulae which are found in every writer. But the evidence of statistics is very strongly against this. To illustrate: in the Epistles of Aristaenetus there are found only 81 cases of the irregular Form 1 among 2297 clausulae (3.5 + %); to these 19 more cases must be added if elision be regularly introduced. In Zosimus 141 cases of Form 1 are found among 3487 clausulae (4.0 + %); to these 27 must be added if uniform elision is to be

employed. In Choricus 25 cases of Form 1 are found among 1563 clausulae ($1.5 + \%$); to these must be added 10 cases on the principle of uniform elision. In the Laudatio Therapontis Form 1 would rise from 14 ($2.1 + \%$) to 23. Further it is frequently found that consistent elision will add more cases to the non-conforming category than to the regular Forms 2 and 4. For example uniform elision in Zosimus would add 51 cases to the number of non-conforming clausulae, while only 22 would be brought into the number of regular Forms.¹ It would therefore be extremely violent to adopt such measures in the matter of elision. The case is even more convincing in regard to crasis, as may readily be seen by reference to the statistics given above on each writer.

But the thesis here maintained can be justified on more general grounds. The explanation of the whole situation seems to lie in this, that we are dealing with a literary dialect rather than a spoken language. The Greek which we see was a purely artificial survival—a stiff unchanging copy of Attic, from which the vulgar tongue was now moving farther and farther away. One kind of Greek was spoken on the street, a different kind was taught in the schools of rhetoric. The change had gone so far that to those who could appreciate the difference, the immortal Attic was a different tongue. The living Greek could not, in the nature of things, be without some effect on the Greek they wrote—witness the use of a rhythm based on word accent—but it was to them the debased phase of the language, and was not regarded as a worthy means of literary expression. There was no one to teach them to speak the real Attic of Demosthenes' day; they could read it in books only; and they must have read it as it was written, and understood it to have been read so. They therefore saw all cases of written hiatus as genuine hiatus; they saw some elisions and some crases indicated; they saw and marveled not, but trustingly received what was offered. When they wrote, therefore, they modeled their language on a *written* Plato or Demosthenes or Isocrates, with the result that they were blind to the real nature of hiatus. It is not surprising that men of letters wrote by the book; the surprising thing is that they read their

¹ When this is not the case, the reason is to be found in the presence of a considerable number of prepositions in clausulae, which are almost always to be read with elision when possible in order to satisfy the law of the rhythm.

books in such an undiscerning way. The Greek of their day must have told them plainly enough that elision, at least, was to be used whenever possible, but they certainly did not write their clausulae on such a principle. Is it possible that a perverse spirit of hostility to the vulgar language moved them to reject its testimony?

This strange situation may well be compared with the condition prevailing in literary Latin prose of the same period. The accentual rhythm came into use in Latin at an earlier time than that at which it was found by the Greek writers, and allowed the same regular forms of accentual clausulae as did the Greek. It was developed from the quantitative rhythm of earlier centuries by a natural growth. Now the quantitative clausulae of Cicero knew no more hiatus than did the hexameters of Vergil; but the accentual rhythm reversed this practice, and recognized no elision. Here again, as in Greek, it must have been brought about by the study of the written language that the classical Latin prose was spoken by the schoolmasters of a later time *as written* (just as we at the present day are accustomed to do), and thus the existence of elision in prose was forgotten, or at least ignored.

In closing reference may be made to the Greek accentual poetry known as Political Verses. Much of this poetry, if it may be so called, has come down to us, but its late date (mostly tenth century and after) detracts from its value as testimony for the earlier Byzantine period. But in the form and treatment of the literary language the variation from century to century was slight, and the attitude of these writers towards hiatus may well be noticed in connection with the matter before us. It is found that the tolerance of hiatus is a matter which varies with different writers. In Constantinus Manasses, *Compendium Chronicum*, (*Corp. Scr. Hist. Byz.*), vv. 2500–2700 there occurs no case of hiatus, while elision and crasis are to be occasionally noted. One case of hiatus was found in another passage, (v. 2306 δύο ἔτη), but it is clear that this writer does not admit hiatus of any sort except in very rare cases, and he regularly elides when hiatus can be avoided in that way. In John Tzetzes, *Historiarum Chiliades*, (ed. Kiessling), I, 1–204, 17 cases of hiatus occur; of these five are justified by their position in the caesura of the verse. One is a quotation of a familiar phrase: ὦτα δ' οὐν, v. 130. Two are cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc.

Κραναοῦ ὑπάρχων, 173.
 τούτου Ἀλνάττης, 155.

The nine remaining cases are :

1. ἔχειν ὥτια δνον, 113.
2. Γαρβαῖός τε ὁ στρατηγός, 74.
3. καὶ δνομα, 67.
4. καὶ Ἀθῆνης, 173.
5. ἐς τὸ Ἡραῖον, 37.
6. Κροῖσος ὁ Ἀλνάττω, 1.
7. ὁ Ἐρεχθεύς, 175.
8. ὁ Ἐριχθόνιος, 172.
9. καὶ τὰ ἀνάκτορα, 161.

Two of these (1 and 2) could be remedied by a natural elision, the remainder by crasis, but the meter requires that they be read with hiatus. Here, then, we have an example of inconsistency which may be compared with the conditions which have been found to prevail in the eight prose writers treated above.

HENRY B. DEWING.

ROBERT COLLEGE, CONSTANTINOPLE.

IV.—BUDDHA AS TATHĀGATA.

One of the commonest designations of the Buddha is Tathāgata, explained as meaning one who has gone the way of all flesh, etc., and derived from *tathā*, "so", and either *gata* or *āgata*, "gone", or "arrived". How and why "so gone" came to mean the Buddha is, however, not obvious. Childers supposed that it meant at first any sentient being, as one who goes the way others go, and that Buddha was simply the sentient being *par excellence*, like Son of Man.

In the older parts of the epic there is not much difference, so far as connotation is involved, between *yathāgata* and *tathāgata*. In both the meaning lies upon the surface. As *pratijagmur yathāgatam* means "they returned as they had come" (Mbh. 3, 57, 40; cf. ib. 105, 19; 107, 8, etc.), so *Nalaṁ dr̥ṣṭvā tathāgatam* means "on seeing Nala in this pass", that is, "returned" (3, 77, 6); just as *taṁ apaśyaṁs tathāyāntam* means "they saw him so-coming", "returning" (3, 56, 23), as previously described, to where he had been before.

But as *tathāvidha*, "of such sort", through evil associations inclines to imply an unhappy sort (*vilāpantiṁ tathāvidhām*, "weeping, so wretched", 3, 59, 16), so *tathāgata* attaches itself by a sort of fatal predilection to what is ill, *tathāgatam pāpam upāiti siddham* (5, 42, 24), etc., so that, when the poet describes horrors, he sums up the description of a furious battle with a *tathāgate*, "in so (grievous) a condition" was the field of battle (7, 186, 18):

"Then darkness horrible, and noise profound—

"Nor earth, nor sky, nor anything around

"Was visible, so (grievous) was the pass" (*tathāgate*).

The same mournful association often characterizes *tathābhūta*. In Rām. 7, 30, 20 (South Indian text), Indra is very wretched, and Brahman, "seeing him in so (sad) a condition", *tathābhūtam*, says, etc. Less often does *tathā* tincture the fluid meaning of other compounds. But we may note its application in a few

cases. For example, a hero falls in battle "like a fire extinguished", and "seeing him so (sadly) fallen", *tathāpatitam*, his followers rally to his assistance (7, 49, 16).

But the connotation of *tathāgata* (when it has any) is always the same, whereas *tathābhūta* varies, so that the latter may refer to something good or bad. Thus a sacrifice *tathābhūta*, in R. 7, 93, 1, is a magnificent sacrifice; while a maid *tathābhūtā*, ib. 7, 2, 19, is in a very bad state indeed, the worst state a maid can be in. If this were true of *tathāgata*, one might say that the circumstances gave the implication. One who weeps is of course in a wretched state; one felled in battle is likewise wretched; and "in such a state" is all that the word means in itself. In that case, however, it would be used indifferently of joyous and sad states, like *tathābhūta*. But *tathāgata*, like the tower of Pisa, has leaned so far over in one direction that it does not recover itself. Or it is like "so so", neutral in form but unmistakably depreciatory in effect. "How is your health?" "Oh, so so", which means that sympathy is due. Thus "seeing the army *tathāgatam*" is "in so bad a shape", never in good shape (7, 90, 5). Similarly, of the individual warrior who faints and falls and is nearly dead; *tam vāi tathāgatam dṛṣṭvā*, "seeing him in so wretched condition" (7, 122, 57). It is almost as plain as the following *tathā kṛcchragatam dṛṣṭvā*, "seeing him in so miserable a pass" (7, 133, 37, and again in 7, 143, 31). No literal meaning suffices here. The hero is neither "gone" nor "returned". He falls where he stood, and in falling he gets into "such a state". This very English phrase approximates to the implication of the Sanskrit. "Such a state as I was in", could be said by one relating his misfortune only.

There is an instance, at 2, 47, 29, which might seem to be opposed to this, but in reality it is not:

*śriyam tathāgatam dṛṣṭvā jvalantim iva Pāṇḍave
amarṣavaśam āpanno dahyāmi na tathocitah,*

"The Pandus' wealth has come to such a pass
"That its refulgence burns me, who am wont
"To feel not jealousy".

It is the rival prince, disconcerted by the horrible luck of his adversary, who is speaking. At most, this passage shows the neutral stage, which may be rendered by "come to such a pass".

Another neutral *tathāgata* in a different form is to be found at 2, 6, 4, also from the earlier epic :

*vayaṁ tu satpathaṁ teṣāṁ yātum icchāmahe, prabho,
na tu śakyaṁ tathā gantum yathā tāir niyatātmabhiḥ*

" We cannot *so go* as the old pious kings,

" Although we yearn to walk the path they trod ".¹

From this to the regularly " miserable condition ", of the battle-scenes, the word passes quite naturally into an adjective euphemistically used of the dead. The misfortune is sometimes formally stated to exist. When the man Ila suddenly became the woman Ilā, it was naturally embarrassing and a little difficult for him (or her), and we are so informed : " This was a grand misfortune for him, beholding himself in so (wretched) a state ", *tasya duḥkham mahac cāsid dṛṣṭvā 'tmānaṁ tathāgatam* (R. 7, 87, 16).²

The meaning " dead " for *tathāgata* is found in both epics. In R. 5, 13, 28 (= 26), it is said of Sugrīva, " If he sees Rāma dead, he will renounce life ", *Rāmaṁ tathāgataṁ dṛṣṭvā tatas tyakṣyati jīvitaṁ*, just as in the following verses, " will cease to live, if the king is dead ", *pañcatvaṁ ca gate rājñi*. In the Mahābhārata : " They went to the place where the king (lay) dead ", *yatra rājā tathāgataḥ* (1, 125, 14). So in 12, 146, 26, where the fowler has caused the bird's death : " Then the fowler lamented and blamed his own act, on beholding the bird dead ", *dvijaṁ dṛṣṭvā tathāgatam*. Finally, after the king and queen had been burned to death, it became noised abroad, " and when they heard that Prthā was dead ", *Prthāṁ śrutvā tathāgatām*, " they lamented greatly ; and they lamented also the death, *niryāṇam*, of the king so sadly burned ", *tathādagdham* (15, 37, 43). Here *niryāṇa*, exit, death, is really " gone out ", as

¹ For *tathāgata* as *tathā + āgata*, compare 5, 34, 20 : *anārabhya bhavanti arthāḥ kecin nityaṁ tathā 'gatāḥ : kṛtaḥ puruṣakāro hi bhaved yeṣu nirarthakāḥ*, " Not worthy to be undertaken are certain aims, so unattainable that human effort expended upon them would be useless " (*agata* = *aprāpta*, unattained, unattainable). Yet the usual interpretation would suffice.

² His story told *yathāgatam* is in the Bomb. text *yathāgamam* ; 7, 88, 4, of SI. Rām. has the same usage as Mbh. Compare *tathāgatām . . . rudatīm*, 6, 114, 89. In 5, 19, 9, *tathāviṣṭām*, describing Sītā wretched, is a doubtful reading, v. l. *athāviṣṭām*. Here also *ihāgata* is " reborn on earth " and *evamgate* is quae cum ita sint (7, 51, 20 and 30), " in such a case ".

tathāgata is "gone so" badly. One who is *tathāgata* is "a gone case", with which locution may be compared a "goner", that is, a person (or thing) lost past recovery; also a "feeling of goneness", as a feeling of faintness, may be compared with *tathāgata* of the fainting hero (above).

So far as I have observed, the cases where *tathāgata* is synonymous with *mṛta*, 'dead', occur only in distinctly later parts of the epic: in the scene of the king's death, which, involving the following Suttee scene, is undoubtedly not early, whatever one may think in general of the epic's analysis; in the Buddhistically flavored scene of the Fowler (Śānti); in the final catastrophe of Āśrama (both belonging in fact to the pseudo-epic); in one passage of the Rāmāyaṇa in Sundara; and in one late passage, where it occurs as the title of Buddha. In the earlier epic it has the meaning "come (go) so", or "to such a pass", or "come (go) so" (as one as gone), i. e. "returned". This is found in the Gambling-House scene (introduction) and in the old Nala episode. In the middle stage of the epic, represented by the fighting-scenes of Droṇa, as cited above, *tathāgata* is almost "dead", but not quite. In no passage here is the man so described in any other than a wretched but still living state; whereas in the pseudo-epic *tathāgata*, whether translated so or not (for one might insist that the word still meant "wretched", "in such a pass"), actually designates a dead person, as it does not in the earlier epic. As if to crown the epic use, occurs the passage to which I have already referred. After Jābali has declared that the food given at a funeral feast is wasted, because there is no life beyond (R. 2, 108, 14 f.), the orthodox Rāma, outraged at such language, exclaims (ib. 109, 34, not in B, but in C, and in the Southern version):

*yathā hi coraḥ sa tathā hi Buddhah,
Tathāgataṁ nāstikam atra viddhi,*

"Know that the Buddhist seems a thief;
"An (atheist) without belief, Tathāgata!"

If, as indicated by the extant Buddhist scriptures, Buddha actually designated himself as the Tathāgata, the word could not then have had its latest epic signification! There is, however, the chance that this was an euphemistic title bestowed upon him after his death by followers avoiding to say "dead"; which

would imply that the texts were written long afterwards, when the writers felt no incongruity in making Buddha apply the title to himself. Perhaps, on the other hand, it is more probable that the Buddhistic term is illustrated not by the latest but by the earliest epic use of the word, such as that in the passage cited above, *na tu śakyaṃ tathā gantum yathā tāir niyatātmabhiḥ*, which implies that one who "can go", that is a *tathāgata*, is perfected, has walked wholly in the path of the good. A third possibility, that *tathāgata* (as cited above) means "so unattainable" (in virtue), seems quite improbable. Judgment may be left to students of Buddhism, *pramāṇam bhavantas*; but, on the surface, it is thinkable that two tendencies of the word united, and established Buddha both as the One Who is Perfect and as the One Who Died.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Origin of Tragedy, with special reference to the Greek Tragedies. By WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, Cambridge University Press, 1910.

Although Mr. Ridgeway's contention as to the Origin of Tragedy has been before the world for years, now in lectures, now in review-articles, the liveliness of its style, its *verve*, its go, does not allow the edge of interest to grow dull at any page in his new volume. It is a book that I have found it hard to lay down for myself, impossible to take up for others except in the character of a summarist. But even the humble part of a summarist, which I am always happy to discharge in the case of a book that interests me, is not to be lightly assumed, inasmuch as at certain points in his demonstration Mr. Ridgeway himself pauses to gather up the results of his survey and thus anticipates the work of the reporter. Such summaries are a godsend to the indolent reviewer, but after all I must go my own way—*ιδίᾱς ὁδοῦς ζητοῦσι φιλόπονοι φύσεις*.

As an anthropologist Mr. Ridgeway starts from the living present and thrusts aside the dead past. The consecrated tradition he knocks into smithereens, or, to be tragically elegant, *λακτίζει εἰς ἀφάνειαν*. The Dorians did not invent tragedy. Aristotle does not say so on his own authority, but gives it merely as an inference that others have drawn from the use of *δρᾶν* for *πράττειν*. The dialect of the chorus is no proof. The so-called Doric forms <adduced f. i. by Mr. Rogers, A. J. P. XXV 285 foll.> are old Attic. And as for the dithyrambic origin of tragedy, the dithyramb was not Doric to begin with. The first man to compose a dithyramb, to call it a dithyramb and to teach it to others, was, according to Herodotos, Arion, a native of Methymna of Lesbos, and for that matter this 'ox-driving dithyramb', which Pindar claims for Corinth, was not confined to the story of Dionysos, who, in fact, had nothing to do with the real origin of tragedy, which took its rise from the worship of the dead and the propitiation of the same, a worldwide phenomenon. It was on this cult, the cult of heroes such as Adrastos, that the orgiastic cult of the Thracian interloper was grafted. Dionysos and his ribald crew seem to have been part and parcel of a cult intimately connected with the fertilization of the earth, and the modern carnival of Thrace, as described by Mr. Dawkins, is a survival of the ancient Dionysiac worship, fawnskin, foxskin, and all. Similar rude dramas are still performed in Thessaly and at

Skyros. Thrace, we all remember, was famous for its wine. <Indeed, the very name of Maroneia brings with it a gurgling memory of the delicious lines: ὁδμή δ' ἡδεῖα ἀπὸ κρητῆρος ὁδῶδει | θεσπεσίη· τότ' ἂν οὖ τοι ἀποσχέσθαι φίλον ἦεν.> The Thracians in the army of Xerxes wore head-dresses of foxskins and moccasins of fawnskins and the Bacchants were Thracian girls. Nor is it strange that this foreign son of Belial should have thrust himself into the place of the local heroes. Similar superimpositions are recorded elsewhere, and we read of Zeus-Amphiaraios, Hermes-Aipyros, Artemis-Orthia. The thymele, according to Mr. Ridgeway, was originally a *bema-bomos*, and the stage was not a *trapeza* for holding the offerings, as Mr. Cook thinks, but a kitchen-dresser used as a temporary stage. <If we only knew the first meaning of σκηνή! For if σκηνή originally meant a 'plank', the fixed combination ἐπὶ σκηνῆς, so much discussed by archaeologists, would be readily accounted for and synecdoche would yield the 'shack' meaning of σκηνή, which is nearer the mark than 'tent'.>

There were two altars, Mr. Ridgeway goes on to say, in the primitive theatre, survivals of two centres of adoration, the tomb of the hero and the fire-altar of the god; not always, it is true, the Thracian god, but prevalently the Thracian god. That he was a late intruder is shewn by the fact that no Attic month bore his name and that the four festivals that did bear his name fall at seasons when there is no vintage <but plenty of drink>. One of the festivals, the Anthesteria, was a great festival of the dead and probably the oldest of all.

The satyric drama was originally a gross licentious rite, supposed, like those witnessed by Mr. Dawkins in Thrace and by Mr. Wace in Northern Greece, to have a potent effect on the fertility of women, flocks and fields. Such was the cult of Dionysos and the only true Dionysiac element was the satyric drama, which, with its Sileni and its Satyrs, came down into Greece from Thrace along with the worship of Dionysos. This accounts for the clear separation in origin between the satyric drama and Attic Comedy proper. Tragedy and satyric drama, as regular rituals, were acknowledged and supported by the state, but comedy, which grew out of mere buffoonery, had no claim to respect as a religious ceremony, and accordingly the state did not take it up until after tragedy had been developed into a distinct *genre* of literature and until comedy, which had been developed on the lines of tragedy, was also recognized as a legitimate form of the drama. <From all which it is evident that Mr. Ridgeway does not accept the ἀγών theory of comedy, according to which comedy arose from the γεφυρισμός and belongs to τὸ θεῖον as the satyr-drama does to Dionysos (A. J. P. X 383; XVIII 243).>

In treating of the rise of tragedy Mr. Ridgeway takes up the famous account that Aristotle gives of the development. The assertion that tragedy had arisen out of the grotesqueness of the

satyric drama seems to him inconsistent with Aristotle's own penetrating statement in which the tragedians are represented as the natural successors of the epic poets, Iliad and Odyssey bearing the same relation to tragedy that the Margites does to comedy, which, indeed, is the true explanation.

There were tragedians before Thespis and rude dramatic performances, but the performances which Thespis gave at Athens were of an entirely new character. <μυρίος αἰών, says the famous epigram, πολλὰ προσευρήσει χᾶτερά τ' ἀμὰ δ' ἐμά.> It was this novelty that excited the anger of Solon in the well known anecdote <and one notes the curious perpetuation of the prejudice against dramatic performances in Solon's remote descendant, Plato>. But the offence of Thespis, according to Mr. Ridgeway, did not consist so much in the impersonation of gods and heroes as in the performance for sport or doubtless also for gain, and that not at some hallowed spot but in any profane place. In like manner the mysteries and miracle plays of the Middle Ages, originally held in church in honour of some holy person and for the edification of the faithful, were transformed into a true form of dramatic literature. <The resistance to such secularization has a very modern illustration in the refusal of the performers of the Oberammergau Passion Play to profane it by reproduction in such an unhallowed spot as New York. The theatre of Oberammergau is really only an extension, as it were, of the church, where the performance begins>.

'Tragedy', as Mr. Ridgeway sums it up (p. 70), 'is really a combination of the lyrical outburst of spontaneous grief for the dead and the heroic lay in which the deeds and trials of hero and heroine were recited in narrative form. In the fully developed tragedy the lyrics sung by the chorus represent the immemorial laments for the dead, whilst the messenger's recitals and the dialogue of the dramatis personae correspond to the narrative and speeches of the epos'.

Mr. Ridgeway next proceeds to attack the much discussed name of tragedy. τραγωδία is a goatsong—<with apologies to Miss Harrison, who derives τραγωδία from τραγεῖν>, and a goat-song is either a song about a goat or a song sung by a goat, <and in recent American political slang a song sung by a goat would be pathetic enough to satisfy all the conditions of tragedy>. Then there is the τραγικός χορός to be considered, a chorus that celebrates a goat or a chorus composed of goats. The theory that the name arose from the circumstance that a goat was the prize in the early tragic contest does not hold water. The first tragic competition was established by Peisistratos B. C. 535. and the τραγικός χορός at Sikyon was much earlier. Bentley's view that the song of the goats means the song of the satyrs who appeared in caprine form finds no favor with Mr. Ridgeway. In Thracian representations the satyrs have the ears, tails and even the feet of horses. Next after man, says Aristotle, the horse

is the most lustful of all animals. The goat, however, is a good third and in later times the satyrs were undoubtedly represented in caprine form. Still, it seems to Mr. Ridgeway unlikely that both the terms tragedy and satyric drama would have been adopted from the satyrs, especially as the very essence of tragedy was already long in use before the introduction of Dionysos and his satyrs.

Hereupon follows a long discussion of Mr. Farnell's paper on the Megala Dionysia and the origin of Tragedy in which the distinguished author of Greek Cults criticizes the main theory of Mr. Ridgeway. According to Mr. Farnell, the origin of tragedy is to be sought in an ancient European mummary, a winter drama of the season in which the black personage Dionysos Melanagis or Melanthos killed Xanthos the Fair One. But for nature myths, once made fashionable by Max Müller, Mr. Ridgeway has scant respect. 'It is easy', he says, 'to turn any story or name, ancient or modern, into a nature myth', and he refers to Dr. Littledale's classical article in which Max Müller himself was turned into a solar myth. <But these nature myths will not down. The heliacal interpretation of the story of Odysseus, of which I made mock some years ago (A. J. P. XXIX 117), has emerged again in Menrad's new book, *Der Urmythus des Odysseus u. seine dichterische Erneuerung: Des Sonnengottes Erdenfahrt.*>

Be that as it may, our brilliant Irish scholar contends that Dionysos was not a goat god when he entered Greece, but a bull god, that he had no monopoly of goatskins, black or other, that goatskins formed the ordinary dress in primitive times, as indeed the ancient *βαίτη* is a common article of attire in Greece even to this day, and that the *τραγικὸς χορὸς* mentioned by Herodotos as performed B. C. 600 was named after this dress.

After a recapitulation of the points already made (pp. 92-3), Mr. Ridgeway in his third chapter, by way of reinforcing his theory that Greek tragedy did not arise merely in the cult of a particular deity, but rather from beliefs respecting the dead as widespread as the human race itself, takes us to Hindustan and to the Sanscrit literature of its Aryan conquerors, to the Sacred Plays of Tibet and Mongolia, the Malay Drama, the Drama of the Veddas of Ceylon and the Kirikoraha at Bendiagalge, and then pauses for another survey of the path already trod.

The fourth chapter deals with the survivals of the Primitive Type in Extant Greek Tragedies, and as Greek tragedies have to do with death mainly, Mr. Ridgeway has little difficulty in finding evidence that tragedy arose from the worship of the dead and that the only Dionysiac element in the drama is the satyric play.

But before passing to the important closing chapter on the Expansion of Tragedy, I must say a word about a sad disillusionment of my own, what may be called in the language of the syntactician an *expergeficient ἀρ' ἦν*.

In the Preface to his *Choephoroi* Mr. Verrall mentions his debt to Professor Ridgeway for the hint out of which has been developed the essay on the scene of the Recognition: 'important', he adds modestly, 'if anything in this volume is such'. (Cf. A. J. P. XIV 398). The hint is the racial peculiarity of the Pelopid hair and foot, a racial peculiarity that effectively disposes of the cheap sneer of Euripides at the work of his great predecessor. It is a hint that Mr. Tucker has also taken in his edition of the play, though, as Mr. Ridgeway complains, without acknowledgment of the source. The explanation, as stated by Mr. Verrall, had a certain fascination for me, having lived all my life in constant presence of an alien race in which hair and foot are marked peculiarities, so that I was prepared to accept enthusiastically Mr. Verrall's statement that Orestes and Electra were octoroons. 'Ebo-shin' and 'gizzard-foot' were familiar words in the mouth of that typical Virginian, Henry A. Wise, who was a close observer of racial peculiarities and taught the youths of my generation to distinguish between the 'mulatto' and the 'molungeon'. To a people jealous of their blood, these things were matters of prime moment. No wonder then, that, carried away by Mr. Verrall, whom I am always happy to follow when I can, the standing phrase ξανθὸς Μενέλαος seemed to be a strong confirmation of the theory, as I have pointed out elsewhere (A. J. P. XXXI 135). Menelaus, unlike Agamemnon, harked back to his white grandam Hippodameia, and passed for a white man; and it was his light complexion that secured for him the hand of Helen, really a goddess of light. But in Mr. Ridgeway's exposition of his own theory Orestes and Electra are of the blonde Achaean race from the North, and thus differ from the dark aboriginal people of Argolis. So it seems that Mr. Verrall has turned the Irish hint round and that I have been guilty of following one of the *idola tribus*. Still, I am happy to think that I need not abandon my theory as to ξανθὸς Μενέλαος, for according to Dr. Brooks, it is much more likely that our μαλθακὸς αἰχμητὴς should have harked back to a white male ancestor than to a white grandam.

In this last chapter, the Expansion of Tragedy, Mr. Ridgeway has some interesting things to say, nothing more interesting than his explanation of what seems to be the strange repugnance of the Danaids to marriage with their cousins, especially strange in view of this form of alliance in the Attic society of the fourth century. The Danaids, however, it seems, represent the earlier period of exogamous marriage, when succession passed through the female line, the *ancien régime* that held its own so long in Egypt <and, according to accounts, has left its traces to this day in Lesbos, the home of Sappho>. It is this same succession that had been the ancient practice at Athens and explains the rebellion of the Danaids against the new order of things, as it yields the main point on which the triumphal acquittal of Orestes

depends. The reconciliation of the old and the new in the person of Hypermnestra is like the reconciliation of the Eumenides. Instead of being conservative, Aischylos, according to Mr. Ridgeway's conception, was in the forefront of his time and this explains the charge of ἀσέβεια. The endogamous theory is far more in accordance with what we know of ancient civilization than the more sentimental view that the *Ikérides* is a plea for love in marriage instead of the legalized rape that marriage is so often even to-day, a crime which Guy de Maupassant depicts with such terrible vividness in 'Une Vie'.

This is an inadequate summary, but I trust not an unsympathetic one. Without sympathy no justice. Some years ago I gave what a French reviewer was pleased to call an ironical account of Terret's *Homère* (A. J. P. XX 87-90), but such has been the progress of unitarianism of recent days that the irony, if irony there be, has lost its edge; and if I do not surrender to Mr. Ridgeway, it is because some of my favorite fancies have been dispelled by a return to the authority of books, and anthropology cannot hope in the long run to oust Aristotle.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

ARTURO FARINELLI, *Dante e la Francia dall' età media al secolo di Voltaire*, 2 vols, I, pp. xxvi; 560; II, 381. Ulrico Hoepli, Milano, 1908.

Thirty years ago (1881) Scartazzini in his *Dante in Germania* noted a few scattered allusions to the life and works of Dante in German literature. Several studies have appeared since that time, treating of the influence of the greatest of Italian poets on various European literatures. Of these the most important is Farinelli's *Dante e la Francia*, which has among its many merits that of showing the utter worthlessness on almost every point of Oelsner's work on the same subject, covering the same period, which closes with the end of the eighteenth century. The work of Farinelli, both on account of the rare industry displayed, and the method of treatment, is one of the most remarkable contributions ever made to comparative literature. The contents of the book more than justifies its general title. The author has not only traced the influence of Dante on French writers, but also the Italian poet's indebtedness to the highly developed literatures of Northern and Southern France which were such sources of inspiration and material to nascent Italian literature. In this connection Farinelli has reviewed the evidence for Dante's sojourn at Paris, to show that however old the tradition, and

however much accepted by scholars down to the present day, it is only a literary invention, which should not be credited. He has shown that the poet's severe judgements on French history gained for him the ill-repute of a political partisan, instead of the reputation of an immortal seer in the writings of the champions of the French monarchy, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Farinelli has not confined his work to a search for direct literary influence in the works in prose and verse of the greatest of modern literatures, of which he gives a critical survey for over a period of five centuries. In the biographies of its authors he has sought for every token of an interest in things Italian, in their travels, the books they read, their associates; no source of information has been forgotten. He has not failed to note the copies in manuscript, or in printed edition of any of the works of Dante, which found their way into the libraries of royal or noble patrons of literature. He has made due comment on the rendering of passages of Dante, cited in a few of the many Italian works, translated into French, a slight indication of the part played by Italy in the development of French civilization. And the far-reaching literary influence, which commenced with the early imitators of Petrarch is drawn in broad lines, making all the more emphatic the fact that just in that period, Dante, to all but the very few, was a literary lay-figure, who could furnish a tag-end of a verse, be the hero of a silly tale, or an authority to be cited by political and religious pamphleteers. Farinelli touches on the commercial relations between the two countries which, among other results, led to the creation of the important Italian community at Lyons, whose printing-presses turned out the forgeries of the Aldine Dante, and the edition of the *Commedia* of de Tournes. In all this mass of detail, set forth in the style of a skilled *littérateur* and not of a painstaking pedant, one can only point out a very few additions and corrections, that should be made.

Writing in 1908 the author should not have referred to an imaginary author Chrétien Légouais (I, 8, n. 1) who, Thomas showed fifteen years ago, was due to a misreading of Chrétien de Troyes (Rom. XXII, 271). K. Hoffman as early as 1870 printed the passage of the manuscript of the prose *Lancelot* to illustrate the allusion to the cough of the dame de Malehaut (Sitzungsb. d. Münch. Ak. 1870, II, 48 ff.) as was noted by G. Paris in 1881 (Rom. X, 483). It is to be noted (24) that a translation of four verses of the *Roman de la Rose* is attributed to Dante as an original effort in an Italian popular tale on the poet (R. Köhler, Gött. gel. Anzeigen, 1869, 765). *Il Re giovane* was not Henry II (31) but his oldest son Prince Henry, who did not live to be king. That Bartholomew, the author of the *De proprietatibus rerum* was not English (108, 4) was pointed out by Delisle (Hist. litt. de la France, XXX, 353 ff.), who also noted that copies of the work were found in Italy in the latter part of

the twelfth century, and showed its relation to the *Proprietates rerum moralizate*, a work composed in Italy between 1281 and 1291 (363, 345 ff.).

For the story of the apparition of "Silo" appearing to one of his pupils, of which Farinelli only knows a Spanish version (113, n), it is only necessary to refer to a note in Crane's *Exempla* of Jacques de Vitry (145-6), and the identification of the protagonist of the story with the historical Serlo by Schwob (*Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. d. Inscriptions*, 1898, 508). The epitaph of Dietzmann, ascribed to Dante (123, n.) has been reprinted and fully discussed by C. E. Norton (*Twentieth Annual Report of the Cambridge Dante Society*, 3 ff.). It is certainly worth noting (141) that the library of the deposed last Pope of Avignon, Benedict XIII, who died in 1424 in his retreat at Peniscola in Catalonia, not only contained a copy of the *Commedia* and some of the Latin works, but also the commentary of Benvenuto, and a Latin translation of the *Commedia* (M. Faucon, *La librairie des papes d'Avignon*, I, 59-61, 85, n.; II, 140, 151). There is no authority for the statement that Chaucer went to Rome on his Italian journeys (144). The most interesting French translation of those sad lines which Dante puts into the mouth of Francesca da Rimini (165, 342) is that found on the wall of a dungeon of the Chateau de Loches in Touraine. With other inscriptions undoubtedly due to Ludovico Sforza, who spent his last years of captivity and died there (*Chronique de Louis XII par Jean d'Andon*, ed. R. de Maulde la Clavière, I, 280, n.), is found written in Gothic characters the couplet:

" Il n'y a au monde plus grande detstresse,
Du bon tempts soy souvenir en la tristesse ",
—(Watts-Jones, *English Illustrated Magazine*, VIII, 390).

One can scarcely expect to find any imitation of Dante in a close translation (278-280) of the vision of Charles the Fat (not Bald), which appears for the first time in the *Chronicon Gentulense* of Hariulf (D'Achery, *Spicelgium* II, 322 ff.), who ended his work with 1088 (Ib. 356), but of which the best text is probably to be found in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* (ed. Stubbs, I, 112 ff.; cf. xxi, 1, xlii, n. 10; II, xxvii), written fifty years later.

Villey (*Les sources et l'évolution des Essais de Montaigne*, I, 112, 234) has made a certainty Farinelli's suggestion (505, n. 3) that Montaigne's citation (II, 12) of *Purg*, XXVI, 34 was taken from Varchi's *Ercolano*, and has also noted (112, 140) that the source of his only other Dante citation was Guazzo's *La civil conversatione*.

Only one phase of his subject has not appealed to the author; the role Dante was made to play as an Anti-papist champion by the Huguenot writers. Perhaps for this reason his interest has not been great enough to trace down the sources of the allusions of

Duplessis-Mornay in his *Mysterium iniquitatis* to Dante and other Italian writers (518; II, 338) to that armory of Protestant controversial writers, the work of J. Wolf printed at Lavingen in 1600, *Lectio-num memorabilium et reconditarum centarii XVI* (I, 610 ff.; II, 683-4). Farinelli has given an analysis of the very rare Huguenot pamphlet, the *Avviso* of Perrot, and noted traces of its use; he has given more credit than was due, as a source of information, to the chronicle of Volterrano; he should have done more than mention the *Catalogus testium veritatis* of Mathias Flaccius, which went through several editions, and was the source of some allusions in French writers (e. g. 509). The Breton song, *Ann Infern* in de la Villemarqué's *Barzaz-Breiz* (II, 98, n.), might be inspired by the *Inferno*, but in the nineteenth and not in the fifteenth century. To attribute to a greater religious faith the more serious interest and profound study of Dante in France and Germany in the nineteenth century (II, 253), is to credit to one cause the resultant forces of a number of great movements. It would not be so surprising as it seems that "l'irlandese Sherlock" is cited as an authority by Le Prevost d'Exmes in his *Vie de Dante* (II, 300, n. 2), and by Farinelli himself (225), if the latter had noted that the work referred to, was in French, *Lettres d'un voyageur anglois*, printed at Geneva in 1779.

With these few comments one can recommend this work as worthy of its subject, a credit to the industry, erudition and literary skill of its author, with whose good critical sense one agrees at every page. It is fittingly dedicated to the memory of Gaston Paris, who living, would surely have commended a work so preeminent for qualities, which made the causeries, lectures and published studies of the great master of Romance scholarship such a source of inspiration to those who have sat under him.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

The Golden Latin Gospels in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan, edited by H. C. Hoskier: New York, 1910. Two hundred copies privately printed by FREDERIC FAIRCHILD SHERMAN for J. Pierpont Morgan. Pp. CXVI + 363 and four full-page facsimiles.

The elegant printing, finest Italian hand-made paper, and simple but elegant binding mark this work as a book-lovers' prize, of which the fortunate recipients of Mr. Morgan's gift are justly proud.

The contents of the book from the scholar's point of view are no less remarkable. The editor's division of his work into

preface, introduction, preliminary remarks and collation. seems at first sight rather awkward and to lead to division of cognate subjects, if not to repetition, but excellent indices obviate any difficulty in the use.

The manuscript was formerly known as the Hamilton Gospels and is probably the most famous Latin Biblical MS in America, yet it is now edited for the first time. It will hereafter be designated by the sign *ℙ*. It is mainly a MS of the Vulgate and was written in England about the year 700 in gold letters on purple or blue vellum. As in many of the older Irish-English MSS the Vulgate text seems to have been imposed upon a good Old Latin base, which still remains in many readings scattered through all the Gospels. These readings and the discussion of them by the editor make the book most important in the study of the text of the Gospels. The Old Latin readings of *ℙ* are parallel to or even antedate the best of the Old Latin MSS, and often find their nearest relatives in the Greek, Old Syriac, or Coptic.

Mr. Hoskier has studied in detail the similarities of *ℙ* with all of these MSS and versions, and with the help of certain Greek cursive MSS, which show decided Latinisms, etc., tries to arrive at a consistent explanation of the cause of such frequent corruption in the early Biblical texts. Dr. Rendel Harris had first suggested, in a study of Codex Bezae, that many of its peculiarities were due to Latin influence and Chase followed referring everything to Syriac. Hoskier builds on both, but combining and correcting, even to the extent that Coptic influence is admitted as of almost equal rank. The method, by which these influences were disseminated, is held to have been the use of polyglot Bibles, having two, three, or four languages in parallel columns.

It is perhaps sufficient to presuppose bilingual MSS like Codex Bezae, and these may well have existed in Greek-Syriac or Greek-Coptic, as well as in Greek-Latin. While the theory is not yet proved, Mr. Hoskier has given us a notable collection of readings illustrating it, and more will be found. In fact the very early Greek MS of the Gospels in the Freer Collection, which I am now studying gives decided evidence. Many Syriacisms of the Ferrar Group, thought to be late in origin by Dr. Harris, are here found in identical form, and the Latinisms noted by Mr. Hoskier also occur. Of a long list of these, which he notes as unique or nearly so in Greek Cursive 243, seven are found in the Gospel's MS of the Freer Collection.

Perhaps of most immediate interest to Biblical scholars is the evidence the editor collects to show that the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS (*ℵ*, *B*) are not free from these corruptions.

Among the many peculiarities of *ℙ* we may note the following: the work of writing seems to have been divided among about forty scribes, i. e., a whole monastery; the last 28 pages of Matthew, because of older writing and finer parchment, are

thought by the editor to have belonged to an earlier volume; the Eusebian canons (incomplete) and the section numbers in the margin, and the characteristic Anglo-Saxon forms of letters and absence of ornamentation may also be noted.

The collation is made with the Clementine Vulgate of 1592, with the addition of Vulgate and Old Latin authorities as far as they are accessible, as well as the evidence of the Fathers. Greek, Syriac, and Coptic evidence is also quoted when in point.

An appendix contains a description and collation of a Latin fragment of the Gospels in the Morgan library. It consists of 18 leaves of the 7-8 century and exhibits an Old Latin text, sparingly revised on Jerome.

HENRY A. SANDERS.

New Edition of the Codex Veronensis (*b*).

E. S. Buchanan, who in Old Latin Biblical Texts, No. V, gave us a new edition of the Latin Gospel MS ff., with *h* of Acts and Apoc., has recently published in O. L. B. Texts, No. VI, a fresh edition of the important Latin Gospel Codex *b*.

This is a great step forward, for besides correcting some of Bianchini's errors, he shows us that Bianchini's line division of the MS was arbitrary and not truthful, which no one could possibly judge from the manner of printing the older edition.

Mr. Buchanan's wish was to re-edit Codex *a* first, but this has not been possible so far. The MS has been removed from Vercelli to Rome as it was in bad preservation, and has there (as I learn recently) been undergoing a "saving" process, and very likely the Benedictine Order may give us a new and better edition. I am quite sure that they can do for *a* what Mr. Buchanan has done for *b* and recover a good many first hand readings lost to us in Bianchini. Mr. Buchanan has recovered about 50 readings in St. Luke where Bianchini had merely printed without comment the readings of ancient second hands.

By far the most important of these passages is Luke xxiii. 34, where we have always been led to believe that *b* left out the first word from the cross, "*Father forgive them for they know not what they do*". A very few MSS have this omission. We can now remove *b** from the list in this great passage, witnessed to by Irenaeus, Origen, Hippolytus and a torrent of Fathers. What happened in *b* was this. The first hand omitted *dividentes etiam vestimenta ejus miserunt sortem*, but had clearly written:

Ihs autem dicebat pater dimitte illis nesciunt quid faciant.

In order to repair the omission of the second clause the *second hand* of *b* calmly effaced the whole of the first clause. "*But*

Jesus said Father forgive them", and wrote IN ITS PLACE the second clause!

Mr. Buchanan has rendered a great service in pointing this out.

Of the rest of the first hand readings recovered, some are confirmed by ff, which agrees; a few are personal touches of *b*, as at Luke xvi. 24: "O pater", for "pater" of the prodigal son's apostrophe, which *b* is not averse to do elsewhere. Some are Syriac as at Luke ix. 23 and ix. 47 against the Greek. Another is bold and interesting: St. Luke xi. 4 in the Lord's prayer *b** had said "*libera nos ab inimico*", which *b*** has revised to *malo*.

The space at our command will not permit of further detailed examination. We commend the new issue of *b* to American students. It is well known that the *b-q* text is important. In fact it lay upon Irenaeus' desk; just as *a* upon St. Jerome's table; *gigas*, and *h* (Gospels) on that of Lucifer; *dimma* on that of Philaster; *e k* in the hands of Cyprian, Arnobius and Optatus; *f* in Ulphilas and Tatian's library: and *moling* in the company of St. Augustine; and just as *c* was known to Auct. op. imp., Auct. de prom. Auct. quaest. Cyril and Tertullian. We are taking more interest in textual criticism in these days, and what may not American scholars accomplish if, properly equipped, they lend their aid in unravelling the interesting questions which arise in connection with the great Graeco-Syriac-Latin base of all these manuscripts. *Fiat*.

H. C. HOSKIER.

SOUTH ORANGE, NEW JERSEY.

REPORTS.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK,
Vol. XV (dedicated to Professor Bücheler on the completion
of his fiftieth year as Doctor of Philosophy). **Second Part.**

297-351. Guil. Konjetzny, *De idiotismis syntacticis in titulis latinis urbanis* (C. I. L. Vol. VI) conspicuis. Examples of peculiarities in number; of confusion in gender, with additions to the collections of Diehl; of confusion in the use of cases; of the gen. abs.; of the extended use of the gen. with adjectives and with verbs; of the subjunctive for the indicative, and vice versa; and of other syntactical peculiarities.

351-352. O. Hey, *Zu den Gerundivkonstruktionen* (cf. ALL. XV. 56 ff.) Examples of the use mentioned on pp. 56 ff. from Pliny's Letters to Trajan, where P. desires approval of action which he has already taken, and where the form is evidently used for politeness or from modesty.

353-360. L. Havet, *Das Verbum eluare* "sich zu Grunde richten". Two verbs, *lavēre*, active, and *lavare*, intransitive, are clearly distinguished in early Latin, but were confused by the scribes. The perfect of both was *lāvi*, which is not parallel to *vēni* in the case of the transitive verb, but was due to confusion with *lāvi* = *lavavi*. *Elavare*, "be ruined" occurs six times in Plautus, for whom a perf. *eluavi* and an inf. *eluere* are assumed. *Eluam*, -as, -at should be emended to *eluem*, -es, -et. There was no confusion with *helluo*(*eluo*).

361-382. M. Pokrowskij, *Zur lateinischen Stammbildungslehre*. Further instances of combination and confusion of suffixes (see ALL. XIII. 460 ff.; AJP. XXXI. 229). 1. *Proletarius* — *proletaneus*, and confusion of -ali-, -ario- and -aneo- (-ano-). Would derive the word from **proletus*, "provided with descendants". Further examples of the same confusion are *extrarius*, *extraneus*; *pedarius*, *pedaneus*; *temporarius*, *temporaneus*; etc. 2. Confusion of -bili- and -li-. *Exitialis*, *exitiabilis*, etc. These were confused in the MSS and both forms passed into the Romance languages. 3. -ia-, -ie-, and -io-. This confusion is apparently Indo-Germanic. Doublets in -ia and -ies are common in Latin: *seria*, *series*; *luxuria*, *luxuries*; *facies*, **facia*, to be inferred from the Romance. Abstract nouns in -ia were formed from the fem. of adjectives, and the change of the fem. sing. to the neut. plur. was an early one in the vulgar speech. Finally all three forms were confounded, and we have such forms as

iustitium, fallacium, etc. 4. Suffix combination and the suffixes -mon-ia-, -mon-io-. These originated in nomina actionis in -mōn. Then an independent suffix -mōnio- (-a-) was formed, when these nomina agentis in -mōn had for the most part disappeared. This took place in the prehistoric period; Plautus has mercimonia and falsimonia. 5. On the late-Latin change of verbs of the third conjugation to the first. The examples from the glosses must be carefully scrutinized, since they are often due to error or to misunderstanding.

382. C. Weyman, Manere = esse. Not uncommon in the poets; see Sil. Ital. XII. 116, Paul. Nol. Carm. XI. 8f., and Sedulius. It finally appears in prose.

383-390. E. Wölfflin, Aus dem Latein des Vergilerklärers Donat. Tiberius Claudius Donatus (ed. Georgii; see ALL. XV. 253) was a professor of rhetoric and wrote with care, hence he is a reliable source for the Latin of the fifth or sixth century. Although he has many characteristics of vulgar Latin, they may well be derived from literary, especially juristic, sources. He shows the influence of Sallust and perhaps of Ennius. The frequently recurring ecce is a mannerism of the lecture-room.

391-399. R. v. Planta, Ein rätoromanisches Sprachdenkmal aus dem zwölften Jahrhundert. The text of fourteen lines of a discourse of Augustine with an interlinear translation in Rhaetoromanic, from cod. Einsied. 199, p. 452, followed by critical notes, a translation into German, and a commentary.

400. A. Zimmermann, Noch einmal die Etymologie von secus (ALL. IV. 602 and XI. 585; AJP. XXX. 98). Additional arguments for regarding this word as from *secu(n)s, a by-form of sequens. The u must be long in the adj.; in the adv. it was shortened by the Iambic Law, the working of which was most common in early times in the case of isolated particles.

401-407. A. Klotz, Klassizismus und Archaismus. Stilistisches zu Statius. An attempt to show that the classicism of the first century naturally led to the archaistic tendencies of the second; that is, it was a further step in the same direction. Both were due to an effort to avoid the colloquial language. This is illustrated by a study of the archaisms in Statius.

418-428. Miscellen. A. Klotz, Ultuisse. Zu Alcimus Avitus. In Epist. 72 Peiper (p. 90, 7) reads ultum isse; it should rather be ultuisse, a form analogous to the infin. in -uiri, and required by the metre. Other notes on Avitus, based on rhythmic grounds, corrections of cod. L, where the order is frequently inverted.

A. Zimmermann, Noch einmal donec. (Cf. ALL. V. 567 ff. and XI. 584 f.; AJP. XVIII. 379 and XXX. 98). From donique, a contamination of *doque and *done, from the prep. and adv.

*do ; cf. quandonique, a contamination of quandoque and quandone, found in an inscription.

R. Meister, *Zu Coripp. laud. Iust. IV. 354*. Corrections of the ed. of Partsch, in *Monum. Germ. auct. antiq.*, III. 2, Berlin, 1879.

H. Jacobsohn, *Mytilius*. That this, and not *Mytilus*, is the correct form in ch. 25 of the *prologi hist. Philipp. of Pompeius Trogus*, is argued from the inscription on a coin of southern Illyricum.

H. Jacobsohn, *Brutes*. An example from an inscription, not entered in the *Thes. L. L.*

H. Jacobsohn, *Contumelia*. The word is not synonymous with *contumacia*. J. would connect it not with *tumeo*, but with *temerare*, *intemeratus*.

P. Germann, *Die sogenannten Varronischen Sentenzen*. (Preliminary communication). This collection should bear the name, not of Varro, but of Seneca, and its origin should be sought mainly in the *Epist.* From the variants of the MSS, *ad Paxianum*, *ad Papirianum* (cod. in *Trin. Coll.*, Dublin), etc., G. would reconstruct *ad Papinium* (*Fabianum*), a teacher of Seneca. He announces a forthcoming study of the sources of the collection.

R. Samter, *Quinquevir*. In *Hor. Sat. 2. 5. 56* would regard *scriba* as the writer of the will, and would interpret *recoctus ex quinqueviro* as meaning that the writer was chosen from among the five witnesses required by law.

429-441. Review of the Literature for 1906. 1907.

442. Necrology. Pater Odilo Rottmanner, by Wölfflin.

443-467. O. Hey, *Wortgeschichtliche Beobachtungen*. I. Die Phrase *Ut ita dicam*. The use of the perf., which occurs first in *Quint.*, was due to regarding the verb as independent, and the mood as potential. The phrase regularly precedes the qualified statement. Its use with relation to similar expressions, *tamquam*, *quasi*, etc., is examined. It is a characteristic of style, occurring most frequently in *Cic.*, but often in *Sen.* and *Quint.* It is avoided by *Caesar*, and by the historians generally, and it is not found in poetry. 2. Zum Gebrauch von *ut ita dicam* bei *Cicero*. He uses it less frequently to apologize for the use of a new word than for an unusual use of a word, a bold metaphor or figure of speech, or the transfer of words to a higher sphere of meaning than their ordinary one.

467. O. Hey, *Zur Assimilation von ct* (cf. *ALL. XV. 275-6*). An additional example (*coatores*) from inscriptions of the first or second century (*CIL. V. 4504* and *4505*).

468. N. Vulić, *Redire, reverti, reducem esse*. Since such expressions may be used of a return to a native country which one has never seen (*Verg. Aen. III. 94 ff.*), it is not necessary in

Spart. vit. Hadr. 1. 3, Natus est Romae . . . ad patriam redit, to substitute Italicae for Romae.

469-472. Th. Bögel, Ein Fall seltener Tmesis. Verecundus, 2. 5 (in cant. deut.) has pseudo quoque christianos impulsat, to emphasize pseudo, and to avoid the postponement of quoque to so long a word. V. also has a tendency to separate the attribute and its noun. Further examples of such cases of tmesis are given, with reference to A. Souter, A Study of Ambrosiaster, Lond. 1905.

473-483. S. Brassloff, Ueber den Gebrauch von proinde und perinde bei den klassischen Juristen. Proinde is usually a deductive particle; the adverbial use (with and without ac, etc.) is rarer. Perinde as a deductive particle occurs but once (in Ulpian), while the adverbial use is regular. A number of apparently exceptional cases are examined, some of which are corrupt, while others seem to show the influence of the Justinian period.

483. P. Rasi, Manere = esse. An additional example from Carm. ad Flavium Felicem de resurrectione mortuorum (Corp. Scr. Ecc. Lat. III. 3. App., p. 310, line 45).

484. A. Klotz, Incessare. This form is doubtful in Statius, but its existence is attested by the grammarian Eutyches (cf. ALL. XV. 377).

485-525. A. Klotz, Die Statiusscholien. The first commentary on S. was written about 400, and soon after that date Sulpicius Severus read his Statius with a commentary. These comments were used by Lactantius Placidius about the middle of the sixth century in his work on S., a work which was in circulation until the Carolingian era. A separate collection of the scholia was made in Monac. 19482 and Paris. 8063 and 8064. We thus have left of Lact. Plac. only the de Statio, but his characteristics as revealed by this work are in harmony with the Gallic literature of the sixth century.

525. L. Havet, Armatus, Bewaffnung. The Thes. L. L. has no example from Cic; but see Caec. 61.

526. P. Rasi, Vömi Perfektform von vomere? This form is cited from Fronto by Forcellini-DeVit. R. would read it in Carm. de Pascha (v. 52, Hartel).

527-547. K. E. Götz, Waren die Römer blaublind? A continuation of the article in ALL. XIV. 75 ff. (AJP. XXXI. 345). An examination of other words than caeruleus, with the same result, namely, a negative answer to the question.

548. W. Heraeus, Obrio und obro. Examples from late Latin of forms derived from these presents indicative.

548, W. Heraeus, Glando. Examples and possible examples of this by-form of glans, additional to the three cited by Georges.

549-559. W. Heraeus, *Zur sog. Peregrinatio Silviae*. Critical and linguistic notes. H. finds that the acc. for the nom. does occur.

559. W. Heraeus, *Crep(a)tura*. The reading of the editions in *Schol. Juv.* 3. 190 is *crepaturas*, of the MSS, *crepturas*. *CGL.* III. 313. 15 has *creptura*, as well as *Anton. Placent. in Itin. Hierosol.*, p. 172. 5 Geyer. The Romance languages, however, point to *crepatura*.

559. W. Heraeus, *Uter, utris*. *Juvenius*, II. 373. and 375 has *ūtribus*, and although he is not trustworthy in metrical matters, this quantity is supported by the evidence of the Romance languages. Additional examples of the nom. form *uter* are given. *Ps. Acr. in Hor. Sat.* 2. 5. 98 has *utris*.

560-564. W. Heraeus, *Der Accusativus nach memor, nescius, u. ä.* A collection of examples of this construction.

564. W. Heraeus, *Lacernobirrus*. Would read this compound in *Acta S. Cypr.* ch. 5.

565-574. E. Wölfflin, *Zu den lateinischen Spruchversen*. The relation of *Publilius Syrus* to *Menander* and *Euripides* is examined. The proverbs are more independent in the former, not being connected with the preceding context by particles. It is difficult to establish a connection between *Seneca de Moribus* and *Publilius*. His relation to *Caecilius de nugis philosophorum* is discussed, with critical notes on *Caecilius*.

574. C. Weyman, *Epikerfragment bei Seneca?* In the *De tranq. animi*, 4. 5, *stat tamen et clamore iuvat* is the first part of an hexameter, perhaps from *Rabirius* (cf. *De benef.* 6. 3. 1).

575-578. *Miscellen*. W. Heraeus, *Congustus*. Examples of this word.

M. Pokrowskij, *Spätlateinisches*. Notes on *Götz, Thes. Gloss. emendatarum*.

C. Weyman, *Evalere*. Not in *Georges*, but occurs in *Vincentius of Lerinum, commonit.*, ch. 5 (p. 6. 25 d, *Jülicher*, 1905; p. 16. 13 d, *Rauschen*, Bonn, 1906; *Florileg. patr. fasc. V*).

C. Weyman, *Cumque = quandocumque*. *Cumque* in *Hor. Carm.* 1. 32. 15 is usually emended, but an example of *cumque = quandocumque* is found in the inscription of *Honorius I* on the *Basilica Vaticana* (cf. *De Rossi, Inscr. Chr. Urb. R.* II. 1, p. 145, et al).

579-598. Review of the Literature for 1907. 1908.

599-602. *Necrology*. Fr. Bücheler, by Fr. Vollmer.

602. Editorial Note, announcing the discontinuance of the publication of the *ALL*.

A supplement to vol. XV contains the following :

Pp. 1-6. O. Hey, Necrology: Eduard von Wölfflin, with a portrait.

7-26. O. Probst, Index to vols. XI-XV.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, XXXII (1908), 3 and 4.

Pp. 175-180. Charles Joret, Villosion's Greek Palaeography. In spite of Villosion's repeatedly announced intention of writing a work on Greek palaeography, and in spite of his friend Chardon de la Rochette's positive statement to the effect that Villosion did actually write such a work, it is clear from a letter of Bast to Wytttenbach that Villosion did not carry out his intention but delegated the task to Bast, who, however, failed to execute it.

Pp. 181-192. Louis Havet, Notes on Plautus. (Continuation. See A. J. P. XXXI, p. 470.) Men. 152. 300. 379-80. 399. 418. 431. 446. 667. 681. 740. 778. 796. 808. 828 (and Capt. 595). 1013 (and Rud. 656). 1069. 1091. 1112. 1144. 1160-1161. (To be continued.)

Pp. 192-193. Henri Grégoire, *Κέλμης ἐν σιδήρῳ*. Following up the clue afforded by Roussel's interpretation (cf. R. de Ph. XXIX, 293-295) of the Kelmis myth in *Paroemiographi Graeci* I, p. 106, 9 ff., Grégoire emends *Κέλμης . . . ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν εὐμενῶς ἐν τῇ Ἰδῇ* so as to read *Κέλμης . . . ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν <πε> φονευμένος <ἐτάφη> ἐν τῇ Ἰδῇ*.

Pp. 194-209. Victor Mortet, Remarks on the Language of Vitruvius. After a brief review of the previous literature on the subject and some general remarks on Vitruvian usage, Mortet treats the following topics: Vitruvius and the language of the agrimensores; abstract substantives; technical terms; degrees of comparison; numerical expressions of measure; various verbs; passive forms; infinitive for the gerund; *erit ut* for the simple future. (To be continued.)

Pp. 210-214. René Pichon, The Probable Epoch of Quintus Curtius. The precise epoch of Curtius is doubtful. The dates of the various estimates range from the time of Augustus to that of Theodosius. Pichon, who already in a previous article (cf. A. J. P. XXIX, 360 sq.) had expressed himself in favor of a late date, inclines to the view that places Curtius in the fourth century of our era. He not only shows that no valid evidence has as yet been adduced against this hypothesis, but he also presents two weighty arguments in favor of it. The first of these arguments is based upon statements in the tenth book, which make it

appear that Curtius holds political views that correspond with those of Lactantius and the panegyrists of Constantius and Constantine. The second argument rests upon the fact that, leaving out of consideration Florus, who is really a rhetorician, Curtius is the first real historian to employ metrical prose. This invasion of the rhythmical clausula into the domain of history, argues Pichon, is much more likely to have taken place in the fourth century, in which metrical prose found its way even into letters, than at an earlier date.

Pp. 215-225. J. Lesquier, Note on an Inscription from Ashmounêin. Lesquier provides a new edition, with critical notes, of a Greek dedicatory inscription that was found at Hermoupolis Magna (Ashmounêin), and was published by Lefebvre in *Bulletin de la Société archéologique d'Alexandrie*, 1908, No. 10. The inscription is written in three columns, and contains names of officers and privates of the garrison of Hermoupolis. In the discussion that follows the text and notes, Lesquier shows that the tactical units commanded by the eponymous officers of columns II and III of our inscription were intermediate in size between a hecatontarchy and a chiliarchy, and were probably called *συντάγματα* in the third century B. C. and possibly *ἡγεμονίαι* in the second. The officers perhaps bore simply the name of *ἡγεμόνες*. Column I contains evidence of the existence of eponymous officers that commanded larger units than the chiliarchy.

P. 226. F. Cumont, Vettius Valens, VII, Prooemium. Comparing Vett. Val. p. 293, 26 (Kroll), Cumont corrects τῶν τε λοιπῶν ἀστέρων, p. 263, 20, so as to read τῶν τε ἑ λοιπῶν ἀστέρων.

Pp. 227-246. Book Notices.

Pp. 247-277. C.-E. Ruelle, *Hermes Trismegistus, The Sacred Book on the Decans*. The So-called Sacred Book of Hermes addressed to Asclepius (Τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ πρὸς Ἀσκληπιὸν ἢ λεγομένη ἱερὰ βιβλος) contains a detailed treatment of the thirty-six decans. In each case the special name of the decan is followed by a description of his pictorial representation, a statement of the part or parts of the body presided over by him, directions for the preparation of an amulet that will serve to ward off the diseases of the parts specified, and instructions as to the kind of food from which to abstain so as not to make the charm ineffective. This interesting treatise, which was first published by Dom Pitra on the basis of an inferior Moscow MS belonging to the Holy Synod, is here re-edited by Ruelle upon the basis of the Parisinus, No. 2256, supplemented by the Parisinus, No. 2502, both of which MSS belong to the Bibliothèque nationale. An elaborate critical commentary is found at the bottom of the pages and a French translation, facing the Greek text, has also been supplied.

Pp. 278-290. Louis Havet, Notes on Plautus. (Continuation from pp. 181-192. See above.) Merc. 305. 496-497. 566-

570. 806. Mil. 24. 37 (also 830 and Amph. 431). 77. 221. 223. 240. 262. 427. 450-451. 483-484. 603. 606. 628-629. 645 (and Rud. 867). 650. 657 (and Symm., epist. 1, 29). 660. 693. 707. 720-721. 754. 762 and 777 a. 830 (see above). 848. 852. (To be continued.)

Pp. 291-299. J. Marouzeau, On the Use of -ST=EST. Besides being used by certain copyists as a convenient abbreviation in long verses, -st is preferred before a punctuation mark or before a metrical pause, whereas est is used as a rule after a pause, or when the verb *to be* precedes its predicate or is emphatically repeated. These rules do not, however, determine the practice of all the MSS or even of all the plays of any one MS. The *Trinummus*, for example, behaves in a peculiar manner in both families of MSS, and Marouzeau's observations thus serve to verify the conclusion reached by Leo in an entirely different manner, to wit, that the text of the *Trinummus* has had a history of its own.

Pp. 300-306. Georges Romain, On Certain Passages in the Letters of Cicero. Critical notes on Att. I, 14, 2-3. Fam. I, 9, 23. Att. V, 15, 3. 21, 1. 21, 12. VI, 2, 7. Fam. VIII, 16, 2. V, 21, 2. XVI, 21, 2.

Review of Reviews for 1907.

C. W. E. MILLER.

BRIEF MENTION.

When the White-Seymour series was set on foot, I partly promised a version of HUG's *Symposium*, but I soon rebelled against the whole scheme. Americans, I thought, had got beyond that stage (A. J. P. X 502, XVIII 122). It was high time to assert our independence. However, my version of HUG was made for my own edification and amusement—the same thing in my case—and it still lies side by side with my rendering of Kock's *Frogs* and other reams of translations and adaptations from the German. The memory of these things comes back to me with the appearance of SCHÖNE's revised edition of HUG (A. J. P. XXXI 367) and their burial service—is it not written in the General Epistle of Jude, 'Twice dead are they, plucked up by the roots'? HUG was a contemporary of mine at Bonn. I wonder what he would have thought of my marginal notes on his performance. I wonder still more what he would have thought of SCHÖNE's changes. If there are such things as ghosts, revisers deserve to be haunted. I never take up the Schneidewin-Nauck Sophokles without calling up the image of Schneidewin, whom I knew better personally than any of my German preceptors, and figuring to myself the scornful expression of that sensitive scholar's countenance. But all scholars are sensitive. We all wince at foreign revision. We are all apt to say as that stout Jesuit is reported to have said: 'Sint ut sunt aut non sint'. To be sure, SCHÖNE professes to have gone to work gingerly and to have made only such changes as HUG himself would have made if he were extant—and could see through SCHÖNE's eyes. Nay, more than that, SCHÖNE professes to have retained much of HUG with which he himself is not in accord, and he says that this holds especially of the Introduction. Now, I will not undertake to verify this assertion throughout, but some of the changes cannot fail to strike the eye even of the casual reader. So, for instance, HUG's long note on the priority of the two Symposia has disappeared, doubtless much to the indignation of HUG's shade, for HUG was a vehement advocate of the priority of Xenophon (see A. J. P. XXIII 455). In the important chapter on the date of the composition of the *Symposium*, SCHÖNE puts the 'pretended anachronism' of 193 A out of court and in his eyes the argument based on the διοικισμός of Mantinea 385, so far from being cogent, is a downright failure.¹ 'A work like the *Symposium* in which the difficult and compli-

¹ From which opinion Raeder, B. Ph. W., 4 Feb., 1911, Sp. 130, dissents emphatically.

cated form of the narrated dialogue is treated with the most delicate calculation and sovereign mastery cannot be the work of a beginner, but presupposes long practice in handling the literary form of the dialogue'. The *Symposium* is a narrated dialogue, and is classed with the *Theaetetus* and the *Parmenides* as one of the dialogues in which the narrator is not an eye-witness, but reports the matter at second hand.

Tears of compassion tremble on my eyelids
Ready to fall

on the watershed of the *Theaetetus* so triumphantly reared by Teichmüller. According to SCHÖNE, the *Symposium* is one of the later dialogues, and as a proof of Plato's advanced age he proceeds to adduce 219 A: ἡ τοι τῆς διανοίας ὄψις ἀρχεται ὅξυ βλέπειν, ὅταν ἡ τῶν ὀμμάτων τῆς ἀκμῆς λήγειν ἐπιχειρῇ. To which the shade of HUG might rejoin that the speaker is Sokrates, that Plato is a dramatist of the first rank and that he is not to be classed with the author of Pelham who always made his hero the same age as the writer happened to be at the time when each novel was written. HUG's long note on 'das momentane Gedankensystem des Philosophen Platon' is suppressed. The savage kick at Herr Krohn—Herr being a deadly insult in philological controversy—is withdrawn, and to make up for the loss of that bit of liveliness there is an addendum to HUG's characteristic of a gentleman whom I would fain call Herr Eryximachos. 'Er ist nicht sehr bedeutend und nicht interessant, hat aber einen gewissen trockenen Humor'. 'Dry humour' is a contradiction in terms, but corresponds somewhat to the Scottish 'pawkins', a form of jocosity which is especially irritating in men who are 'neither important nor interesting'. Of course, I quite agree with SCHÖNE in his estimate of Eryximachos, whose name Teuffel has etymologized as the 'Belchfighter' (Ἐρυξίμαχος q. d. ἐρευξίμαχος), a name quite suited to his glorious victory over Aristophanes' hiccups, and quite suited to that other temperance advocate with whom I have elsewhere compared him, Sir Toby-Belchfighter Malvolio (A. J. P. XXX 109). But I have no desire to etymologize away the personality of Eryximachos, and in like spirit SCHÖNE refuses to join HUG in etymologizing away the personality of Diotima, refuses to be one of those who 'spy a great peard under her muffler'. The history of Greek proper names is an interesting chapter, and I have often wondered whether the unfortunate Diotimos of the Anthology, Γαργαρίων παισὶν βῆτα καὶ ἄλφα λέγων, was not a descendant of the seeress who taught Sokrates the secret of true love (Hellas and Hesperia, p. 14).

These specimens of the variations in the Introduction must serve. With the comparison of the two commentaries I dare

not trust myself, though the comparison would be a good class exercise such as I sometimes recommend to my students as illustrations of the progress of doctrine. Indeed, the old editions *cum notis variorum* may be made to yield many philological, many moral lessons. So much is deemed worthy of note that has passed over into the realm of 'cottidianae formae'. So many authorities are cited that have ceased to be authorities. So many interpretations are disputed that are not worth adducing. And all these three types are represented on the very first page of the HUG-SCHÖNE *Symposium*. The spelling *πρόην* is taken for granted. 'Judeich' has taken the place of 'Bursian', and the discussion of the pun in *Φαληρεύς* has disappeared together with HUG's wonderful hendecasyllabic verse. Further on Apollodoros loses the surname *μανικός* and the Bodleian *μαλακός* is restored with an elaborate justification (173 D). The prodigiously long note on the form of *oratio obliqua* in the *Symposium* is sent packing, but while the new editor evidently yawns over the screed about the 'perverted proverb', 'Αγάθων' ἐπὶ δαίτας ἴασιν αὐτόματοι ἀγαθοί, he finds himself obliged to retain it because he has nothing better to put in its place, and actually adds to it by quoting Adam's article in *Classical Review* X 238.

Another long note on the article with proper names 174 D is saved alive. It is not especially helpful, but the utterly needless discussion on *ἀπονίζειν* is reduced to three lines. 175 B SCHÖNE makes short work of *ἐπειδὴν τις ὑμῖν μὴ ἐφεστήκη*. Instead of trying to emend the passage, he gives it up as a *locus conclamatus*. At least no one has succeeded, he says, in restoring it, and the context yields no cogent conclusion as to the sense of the clause. 175 D HUG's *κενότερον* and *κενοτέραν* are brushed away without apology. BTW are more potent than Choïroboskos and the Herculaneum MSS and Dindorf, Dem. lv 27. I fancy that HUG would have held on to *κενότερον* as Kynaigeiros held on to the Persian boat. Oddly enough, rejected in SCHÖNE's text, *κενοτέραν* holds its own in the notes,—under the circumstances an unfortunate typographical error. So 175 E *πλέον ἢ τρισμυρίοις*, *πλέον* is put back instead of the more recondite *πλεῖν* and the discussion of the capacity of various Greek theatres is ruthlessly cut out. How much more piety Mr. Pearson has shown in his edition of Headlam's *Agamemnon*, where for instance he has retained a long string of *παρὰ γνώμην*'s that are of no conceivable use except as evidence of Headlam's wide reading which nobody is disposed to deny, as nobody will deny Tafel's wide reading (*A. J. P.* XXXI 485).

But for the constituency of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY, for scholars who are no longer in the seminary stage, it

would be a sheer weariness, if I were to go through the book and show how unsparingly SCHÖNE's pruning-hook has been applied, and with one more illustration of the progress of doctrine I will pass on. The grotesque figure of the globular man-woman which rejoiced the eyes of the readers of the first edition of HUG (189 E) was suppressed in the second, but alas! in SCHÖNE's note the ball that rolled so merrily in the old commentary has been succeeded by a prosaic cylinder that crushes out all the joy of the passage. In short, the ideals of the two editors are different. SCHÖNE believes, as I do, in illuminating the text, HUG believed in enlightening the student. Theoretically, a classic is a ζῆλον, not a clothes-horse, on which to hang syntactical analyses or archaeological disquisitions. Theoretically, every needless word in a commentary is an impertinence, but practically no commentator schools himself to such renunciation. Who would give up Lobeck's Ajax or for that matter Peter Burmann's Petronius? We must deal gently with the memory of HUG and I rejoice that to my objurgations against his prolixities and drearinesses 'is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever', to come back to the General Epistle of Jude (A. J. P. XXXI 367).

Now no one will find fault with Mr. BURY, the first English editor of the *Symposium*, for being prolix. Even without the guidance of SCHÖNE he has kept bounds in his adaptations of HUG, to whose useful and scholarly edition he has frankly acknowledged his indebtedness. Of course, every editor is indebted to his predecessors, and while a blanket acknowledgment like Stahl's (A. J. P. XXIX 259) is not always satisfactory, still life is too short to trace every observation to its ultimate source. The late Professor Morgan used to amuse himself with genealogies of that sort in the commentators to Persius, but the 'non sua poma' are often apples of Sodom and not worth claiming (cf. A. J. P. IX 126). A judicious conveyance is a real service and Mr. BURY has earned a right to help himself to the stores of others by contributions of his own. A closer study of Mr. BURY's work has modified in his favour my original impression, and I am not going to indulge in the kind of criticism that speckles the pages of *Brief Mention*. Mr. BURY's Introduction is very elaborate, and to one who has tried to make something out of the *Symposium* for himself, it has a distinctly personal interest. Like Mr. BURY I have attempted to establish for myself the interrelation of the five speeches, and in January, 1887, I published a paper on the subject in the Johns Hopkins University Circular, No. 55, an abstract of a more elaborate essay which was to have appeared in the Journal. But the longer paper was crowded out by other and more important matters. Cf. A. J. P. XV 92. Other and more important matters will doubtless crowd it out to the end.

In these days of monographs, it was inevitable that the grammatical figure known as the poetical plural or the plural for the singular should be passed under the harrow. First the Latin usage was taken in hand by Maas in the *Archiv* for 1902 (A. J. P. XXX 342-3), and then the Greek, from which the Latin was largely derived, by KARL WITTE in his *Singular und Plural* (Teubner, 1907); then three years afterward by HORACE LEONARD JONES in *Cornell Studies* (Longmans and Green), *The Poetical Plural of Greek, studied in the light of Homeric Usage*. As so often happens in America, the material had been gathered and the results reached before the writer had come into possession of the foreigner's work. Similar instances of what might be called philological laches might be cited even when the *pereant male* predecessors had published their conclusions, not in Germany, but in America. But after all, there is always an interesting difference in the angle of vision, and the student is not the loser for the lack of bibliographical vigilance. Now it is not my purpose in this *Brief Mention* to compare the two works, but simply to make some irresponsible remarks on the general subject. The underlying principles are simple enough, and, which is of no little importance, the phenomena may be brought to the test of consciousness in the vernacular, which yields abundant illustrations.

The plural for the singular rests ultimately on a shift of conception, then follows analogy, more or less close analogy, which is often prompted by metrical convenience, by that *metri causa* at whose door so many unfathered bantlings are laid. What is poetic in one language is prosaic in another, and numbers shift within the range of the same language. Mass, the category with which WITTE opens his study, is singular. The plural gives a variety of samples. 'Ashes' has a plural feel for us. So has 'oats'. Not so 'pearlash', 'potash', 'oatmeal'. The 'ash' of a cigar means something else than the 'ashes' of a cigar. 'Gold' and 'silver' have no plural, but 'irons' and 'coppers' are used in a special sense. When the Greek says αἵματα he means 'gouts of blood'; when we say with Shakespeare 'young bloods', we mean νεανίας, for which 'young bloods' is a better translation than 'princoxes' (A. J. P. XXXII 117). 'Water' gives one aspect, 'waters' another—either 'the waters that come down at Lodore' or mineral springs, for which the plural is invariably used. ὕδατα and πηγαί are both poetic in Greek. WITTE hesitates about δρυμά and inclines to Homeric analogy with δένδρεα. 'Into the woods my Master went', sings Lanier. It is not at all the same thing as 'the wood'. In the mouth of those who are not bound by grammar you can actually hear 'a woods'. 'Molasses' in certain parts of our country is a plural. During the Civil War it was a scarce article, and, as I have noted elsewhere, the plural might have been set down as a *pluralis maies-*

tatis, and there are those who can bear witness to the curious extension of analogy to the once familiar and always dire substitute for molasses. The same people who said 'those molasses' said also 'those sorghum'. And so our vernacular can help us to understand those shifts of conception of which so much is made. WITTE'S next category has to do with parts of the body. In English symmetrical parts of the body pair off as in Greek, but we distinguish. 'Chest' is a unit, 'breast' is noncommittal, 'breasts' distinctly feminine. *στέρνα* is analogous to *στήθη*, itself analogous to *μαστοί*. We do not analyze the back, as the Greek does occasionally in *πῶτα*, nor the 'midriff', as the Greek does in *φρένες*. In fact the 'midriff' has become even more of a book-word than 'diaphragm'. One seldom hears either word in conversation. Then there is the chapter of abstract nouns. 'Pluralizing abstracts makes them concrete' is a convenient way of putting the phenomenon in Greek and Latin, but what we call abstract was to the Greek a personification (A. J. P. XVII 366; XXXI 145)—'a father', or more frequently 'a mother'. The neuter is the fruit of an action. This may account for the more extended use of the distributive plural in Greek than in English. The plural for the singular of persons and personal belongings is largely 'affectations', mock modesty, sham evasion of responsibility, with the resultant *ἄγκος*. These are things of which so much is made in grammar, and which might well be treated under the head of rhetoric.

When these phenomena occur in poetry, the question of metrical convenience is to be considered. The Pindaric *ἄμῶν* = *ἡμέτερον* (P. 3, 27) may bid us pause and study the situation, but *ἡμέτερος* = *ἐμός* is often a mere metrical convenience (A. J. P. XX 459). And the same thing is notorious in Latin. Cicero's shiftings from *nos* to *ego* and *ego* to *nos* in his letters have prompted an inquiry into the fluctuations of that sensitive soul (A. J. P. XIX 234), but in the elegiac distich we dare not refine. It is a matter of spondaic words, in which Latin abounds, and of iambic words, of which there is no superfluity in Latin. Spondaic forms of *nos* = *ego* haunt the hexameter and crop up in the first half of the pentameter, but in the latter half there is no lack of *mihi*'s and the possessive of the first person singular. 'Sitque memor *nostri* necne, referte *mihi*', says Ovid; 'Et mala si qua tibi dixit dementia *nostra*, | Ignoscas: capiti sint precor illa *meo*', Tibullus. So it is always a fair guess whether the exceptional use of plural for singular or vice versa is due to poetical vision or metrical vise, and there is always opportunity for wrangling over details of interpretation.

Some very interesting facts of poetical usage come out from the exhaustive record of these variations and the grouping of the

phenomena may be manipulated so as to yield important results. So WITTE has made use of singular and plural for the stratification of Iliad and Odyssey. If all these stratifications only coincided throughout! (A. J. P. XXII 468). There are indexes to both treatises, WITTE's and JONES's, which will facilitate the use of them, and will doubtless serve to generate other monographs. Dr. JONES has made use of the term 'dualizing plural', which I myself have found convenient. Usener, it will be remembered, attributed the mystic significance of the number three to the inability of the primitive man to count beyond that number, in spite of the *πέντε* with which nature has provided him. 'Certain expressions in which 'three' means 'many' point back to a distant time when our ancestors had developed no conception of number beyond three' (A. J. P. XXV 97). If this is so, we may suppose that the plural began with two and paused before it struck out to the provisional limit of three. When that was reached, the dual was formed to distinguish 'bothness' from 'twoness'. The dualistic explanation fits many examples that are set down under other categories.

WITTE is, as we have just seen, a Separatist—one of those whose dissecting knives Mr. ALEXANDER SHEWAN has undertaken to blunt and to break in his book, *The Lay of Dolon, Homer Iliad K* (Macmillan). A determined Unitarian is Mr. SHEWAN, and he is proud of flaunting the banner reared by Col. Mure. True, it requires scant courage to be a Unitarian now-a-days. 'Einheitshirten' and 'Kleinliederjäger' are no longer terms of contempt. The two armies mingle, mingle, mingle as they mingle may, with the privilege of flying at each other's throats when a new quarrel is started. Brought up under separatist influences myself, I found many years ago that for me at least it was impossible to rouse popular interest in things of shreds and patches; and for an audience of non-Grecians I have always treated the Odyssey as a seamless robe. If I had been possessed of the genius of Professor Murray, I should have been more faithful to such convictions as I had, but once enlisted in the cause of the defence, I became immeshed in my own sophistries—as they were to begin with—and the pitiable results of a lack of faith are discernible in the summaries I have given from time to time of works on the Homeric Question, which still possesses for me a fatal fascination. But as I resisted the temptation to give a summary of Wilamowitz's tractate on Iliad Θ, in which he holds that Θ was composed in order to bring I and K, then independent lays, into the Iliad, so I must resist the temptation to follow Mr. SHEWAN in his defence of the Doloneia, which even many Unitarians have abandoned to the tender mercies of the wicked dissectors. To one who has lived through a great

war, the *Doloneia* is one of the most interesting books in the *Iliad*. I never open it without thinking of Jeb Stuart's ride round the army of McClellan as it lay before Richmond, and I say to myself: A great war without a raid is unthinkable. Who would wish the *Doloneia* away? But Mr. SHEWAN goes much farther than that and in a series of chapters which deal incidentally with the canons and methods of Homeric Criticism, point after point is taken up and at the close of each chapter the verdict is given in favor of κ . The lay is an uncontaminated unit. The linguistic attack is repelled. The alleged difference between *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is scouted. Monro's formidable list loses its fierce aspect on nearer examination, and Mr. SHEWAN continues to treat the language of the two epics as one and the same. No wonder that he welcomes the accession of Professor Scott, who has effectually refuted the notion that the *Odyssey* shows a marked advance in the number of abstract nouns. The verbal peculiarities on the surface of κ are perhaps more numerous than in some parts of the *Iliad*, but the popularity of this detachable lay would have involved more copying and led to more copyist's errors. Odyssean connection is not to be inferred from prepositional usage, and the articular evidence does not prove κ to be late. There is no case against κ in the digamma. The charge of plagiarism is rebutted. Armor and dress described in κ do not contribute anything to the proof that the lay is not ancient. The question 'Is the *Doloneia* a burlesque?' is answered in the negative. κ stands and falls with the *Menis*. If α is old and genuine, κ is not to be condemned as modern, spurious and Odyssean. The *Doloneia* appears to be as old as the original *Iliad*, or the original *Iliad* of the critics. But this summary which I have given as nearly as possible in the words of the writer must suffice for this number.

In a famous line of Kratinos, ὑπολεπτολόγος, γνωμοδιώκτης, Εὐριπιδαριστοφανίζων, 'A splitter of hairs, a monger of saws, a Euripidaristophanizer', the interpretation of Εὐριπιδαριστοφανίζων is open to controversy. But it seems fairly evident that it is intended to enhance the other two epithets and that Kratinos, the Aischylos of the Old Comedy, who had no patience with supersubtlety and only the average Greek fancy for sententious reflexion, is girding at his saucy young contemporary for his likeness to the very poet whom he is always mocking. Everybody knows the danger of habitual mockery. Pick out a butt and, as time goes on, a fatal assimilation takes place between the assailant and the assailed, and the enemy becomes one's next friend, one's self. But, not to discuss the resemblances, native and acquired, between the style of Euripides and the style of Aristophanes, Professor CARLO PASCAL's recent work on Aristophanes seems to favour another

interpretation of the hybrid word. In his *Dioniso, Saggio sulla religione e la parodia religiosa in Aristofane* (Catania, Battiato) after a detailed study of Aristophanes' treatment of the divine personages and religious ceremonies that figure in his comedies, Professor PASCAL comes to the conclusion that Aristophanes was, as it were, a spiritual brother of Euripides. But if irreverence is the bond that unites the two poets, it is not a charge that could fairly be brought against Aristophanes by Kratinos, for who could have made freer than Kratinos in his *Némeis* with the august personage of Zeus and the fair form of the mother of Kastor and Polydeukes?

The irreverence of Aristophanes, like the irreverence of Euripides, is a familiar theme and Professor PASCAL's essay is plentifully garnished with literature. But it has its parallel and its explanation in what goes on to-day in Latin countries. Obdurate saints are held to an account for the failure to answer prayer and their images are chastised by the faithful. No Anglo-Saxon girl would pitch the statuette of St. Joseph out of window as happens in that charming story 'La Neuvaïne de Colette'. And not only the saints. I have before me as I write a proclamation of the alcalde of a South American town, in which that magnate gives the 'Supreme Creator' warning of all the dire proceedings that are to ensue if He continues to withhold rain beyond a certain date in order that said Supreme Creator 'may understand with whom He has to do'. But the very maltreatment, the very threats, involve faith, and that is the great difference between Aristophanes and Euripides. There is no question of the existence of the gods in Aristophanes. Euripides is skeptical. Euripides' acid is the acid that eats up the molten image. The acid of Aristophanes is a mild solution that merely stings and prickles, but does not destroy. Orthodoxy covered a multitude of sins then as it does now. Aristophanes was orthodox, Euripides was a rationalist, if one dare use so modern an expression. Religion being an affair of state, the Greeks were not exacting. *νομίζειν θεούς* is not a matter of conscientious ground of action, as Mr. Neil says in his note on the Equites, 515. That is one of those *obiter dicta* that are always bobbing up in commentaries. *νόμος* is convention. Accept the gods the state provides and all is well. The trouble with the Christians under the Roman Empire was that they were so absurdly uncompromising, that they followed the direction *μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε* so closely. No sensible Roman could understand their attitude. A pinch of incense, a kiss of the hand would answer? What reasonable human being would object to meats offered to idols? *λεπεία* after all is only butcher's meat. Those of us who are old enough to remember the days of what was called Bibliolatry can testify that it made a great difference whether Tom Paine took a liberty

with Scripture or a professed believer, prelate or presbyter. The ministers of the Word, owing to their familiarity with the text of Scripture, furnished more than their quota of what would have been profane in an infidel, and, as children, the sons of divines had to be specially cautioned against trivial use of the Bible. There is not much danger of that now. It was but the other day that I saw the phrase 'abomination of desolation' attributed to Voltaire. But are we really more reverent than our grandfathers?

According to Professor PASCAL, Aristophanes is usually set down as a fierce reactionary, an alarmist hater of anything like innovation (*feroce retrivo, pavido odiatore di ogni novità*). This is certainly what Deschanel says, who compares Aristophanes to Bossuet and calls him 'conservateur fébrile et réactionnaire enragé'. On the contrary, PASCAL thinks that his examination has proved Aristophanes to have been a man who shews freedom and independence of thought, freedom and independence in his attitude towards the problems of public life. In his art he avoids the well-worn paths and conventional forms. He inveighs against low comedy, though, to be sure, he makes use of the old machinery at times, albeit in a much more discreet and reserved fashion than his rivals (A. J. P. X 265 ff.). His determination to be original is shown by his Hermes, who is very different from the Hermes of tradition and has taken on some of the features of Herakles. But the main thing that Professor PASCAL emphasizes as the result of his studies is that Aristophanes' comic treatment of the deities has its germ in the literary and popular tradition of the various gods and the surnames attached to them in religious observances, which nobody will deny. But the real point is the spirit in which Aristophanes makes these assaults upon the personages of the Greek Pantheon.

The next observation of Professor PASCAL's conclusion has been anticipated, and no one will be startled when he goes on to say that Aristophanes, like so many other men of antiquity, takes an exclusively political view of religion. Hence his implacable satire against alien gods. In this regard as in others Aristophanes is a chauviniste. But I cannot agree with Professor PASCAL in thinking this chauvinism a proof of his disputed Athenian origin. There is such a thing as being more royalist than the King, of being more Southern than Southerners born.

But the charm of the subject has carried me beyond the limits of *Brief Mention*. Aristophanes is always an interesting theme,

and PASCAL'S book is an interesting book. The author takes us through some of the most amusing scenes of Aristophanes. He is pleasant company and I am not going to point out the lapses of the *cicerone*. Indeed, how indulgent I am may be seen in the fact that I kept on reading after I reached p. 148, where one finds the astounding statement that the Protagoras of Plato is undoubtedly earlier than the Birds of Aristophanes. It is the case of poor Placido Cesareo over again (A. J. P. XXIII 446; cf. XXX 358). There must be something bewildering in the air of Sicily.

More than forty years ago I wrote :

The whole body of our literature is penetrated with classical allusions. In the *Märchen* of Goethe the will-o'-wisps 'with their peaked tongues dexterously licked out the gold veins of the colossal figure of the composite king to its very heart, and when at last the very tenderest filaments were eaten out, the image crashed suddenly together'. And some such fate would overtake our higher culture if the golden threads of antique poetry and philosophy were withdrawn. (*Essays and Studies*, p. 44.)

These words come back to me as I turn over the pages of the new edition of Professor GAYLEY'S standard work *Classic Myths in English Literature and Art* (Ginn and Co.). These classic myths belong to the gold veins of our literature, a composite colossus, if ever there was one. For him who knows them already it is a joy to trace them in Professor GAYLEY'S book. For those who do not, he has provided welcome and adequate guidance. And yet one always misses something. The paucity of references to Pindar stirred in me again the desire that some one would do for him what has been done for other great poets, and note the impress of his lonely genius on modern poetry. The Pindarists, needless to say, are not Pindaric, just as the *schema Pindaricum* is practically a misnomer (A. J. P. XI 182). Professor GAYLEY has given us the every day references to the Islands of the Blessed and to Pelops and Hippodameia, but Pindar would have been mortified to find that he clave to Herakles in vain and that the splendid First Nemean is not cited, nor the Third Olympian with its profoundly significant account of the Founding of the Olympic Games.

With his infallible instinct for popular demand the author of the *Grundriss zur Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie* has laid us all under obligations by the publication of his *Imagines Philologorum* (Teubner), a collection of 160 effigies of famous scholars from the fifteenth century down to our time. The diligence with which Professor GUDEMAN has brought together these likenesses, some of which were very hard to procure, is

worthy of all praise, and the book will have its place in every scholar's library. To be sure, when it comes down to my day and to men whom I have known personally, I must confess to a feeling of disappointment here and there. Ritschl is fairly well represented by the well-known lithograph of Hohnneck. Welcker is barely recognizable. Boeckh is not my Boeckh as he appears in the fine portrait by Begas, which is not very well reproduced in Sandys. Bekker is almost a caricature, though it serves to illustrate the anecdote told in A. J. P. XXVIII 113. Carl Friedrich Hermann is poor. The sketch of Weil is artistic and may be considered symbolical, but those who wish to see the man as he was when first I knew him will find him to the life in the photogravure accompanying Perrot's tribute (A. J. P. XXXII 118). There are better representations of Usener's handsome features easily accessible. And so on and so on. But on the whole it is an exceedingly valuable and suggestive collection, one which a scholar will be tempted to look at long and long, as Walt Whitman looked long and long at the animals. Unfortunately, beauty born of the murmuring sound of Greek and Latin has not passed into the faces of many of our guild, and we must sadly say of this one and that one as Pindar said of Melissos:—
ὄμοιός μιν ἰδέσθαι, συμπεσεῖν δ' ἀκμῇ βαρύς.

Two eminent scholars among my correspondents have come to the defence of Browning in the matter of the sex of St. Praxed (A. J. P. XXXI 488). The line of defence is the same. The Bishop's mind is wandering and he has mixed up Christ and St. Praxed. He had previously spoken of the 'Saviour in His Sermon on the Mount, Saint Praxed in a glory', and now tries to combine the two. Hence the confusion of sexes which could hardly be laid to the charge of the Bishop when in his sober senses. 'It is bad art', says one of my correspondents. 'It is worse than a blunder. It is a crime', as all supersubtlety is. However, in the eyes of the Browning worshippers, the smudge, as I called it, has been turned into a halo and I take shame to myself for idly repeating a criticism that followed hard upon the publication of the poem. But after all I console myself with the thought that I suppressed an audacious comment on a notorious word which smirches the skirt of Pippa Passes. Let others decide the question of Browning's responsibility—by the light of Aristophanes' Apology. God is in his heaven, all's <wrong> with the <word> and I resume my study of the new edition of the scholia to Lykophron.

Forty-five years ago I took the census of the Latin Grammars in common use, and not only in this country, and was amazed to

find how often the unscholarly 'amaturus esse', 'amatus esse' occurred in the paradigm of the verb. He who writes thus may have a soul for the infinite. He has no feeling for the infinitive. And so I uttered my voice as of one crying in what Dr. Gudeman (A. J. P. XXXI 113) considers the philological wilderness of the United States (L. G.⁸, § 420), but to small purpose, if I may judge by the last Short Method with the Latin language I have seen. And what wonder when a man like Van Leeuwen on Eccl. 371 writes *πλυνὸς γίγνεσθαι*.

H. L. W: In view of the well-known difficulty of finding American houses willing to undertake the publication of scholarly works of elaborate character, it is gratifying to observe that European publishers are more ready than they once were to give to the world in monumental form works of high grade from the pen of American scholars. Under the title of *Palaeographia Iberica*, Professor JOHN M. BURNAM of the University of Cincinnati is soon to issue in Paris at the press of Honoré Champion a collection of facsimiles of manuscripts and documents in Latin and the Romance languages of Spain and Portugal. These facsimiles, taken from manuscripts of the principal libraries of Europe, will be accompanied by transcriptions, together with a bibliographical and palaeographical commentary, and will form a welcome addition to the apparatus of the student of the Visigothic hand, who has hitherto depended chiefly on the collection of Ewald and Loewe for purposes of illustration. From the point of view of the Romance scholar the new work will have even a greater value; for it is the first to furnish the palaeographer with facsimiles of manuscripts in Portuguese and the first of any importance to present such illustrative material in Spanish. The collection will appear in a limited edition of three hundred numbered copies and will consist of fifteen parts of about twenty plates each at a total cost of 375 francs. Professor BURNAM is to be heartily congratulated on the completion of this important work, which will soon take its place in the great libraries of the world as a worthy monument of American scholarship.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Burton (H. E.) A Latin grammar. New York, *Silver, Burdett*, 1911. 13+337 pp. 12°, 90 c.

Caesar's Conquest of Gaul; being pt. 1 of the larger work, by T. Rice Holmes. New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 36+184 pp. 1l. 8°, \$2 net.

Caesar and Nepos; for sight reading. New York, *American Book Co.* 170-247+118 pp. 12°, 30 c.

D'Ooge (B. L.) Latin for beginners. Boston, *Ginn*, 1911. 12+348 pp. 12°, \$1.

Grundy (G. B.) Thucydides and the History of his Age. London, 1911. 572 pp. 8°, 16s. net.

Mendel (C. W.) Sentence connection in Tacitus. New York, *Yale University*, 1911. 158 pp. 8°, \$1.25.

Mierow (C. C.) The essentials of Latin syntax; based on Caesar and Livy. Boston, *Ginn*, 1911. 6+98 pp. 12°, 90 c.

Petronius (*Bellum Civile*). With Commentary and Translation by Florma T. Baldwin. New York (*Columbia University Press*), *Lemcke & Buechner*, 1911. 264 pp. 12°, \$1.25 net.

Shewan (Alx.) The Lay of Dolon (The tenth Book of the *Iliad*), some Notes of its Language, Verse, and Contents. London and New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 330 pp. 8°, 10s. net, \$3.25.

Wetmore (M. N.) *Index verborum Vergilianus*. New Haven, Ct., *Yale University Press*, 1911. 10+554 pp. 8°, \$4 net.

Wodehouse (S. C.) English-Greek Dictionary. London and New York, *Dutton*, 1910. 1038 pp. 8°, 15s. net, \$5.

Xenophon. Xenophon's *Anabasis*. Bks. 1-4; ed. by M. W. Mather and J. W. Hewitt. Text ed. New York, *American Book Co.* Pap., 40 c.

FRENCH.

Bulletin annuel d'épigraphie grecque publ. par A. J. Reinach, 2^e année 1908-1909, in-8°. *E. Leroux*. 2 fr. 50.

Cagnat (R.) et Besnier (M.) L'Année épigraphique romaine. Année 1910 (fasc. 23), in-8°. *E. Leroux*. 3 fr. 50.

Carra de Vaux (B.) La langue étrusque. In-12. 5 fr.

Collignon (Max). Les statues funéraires dans l'art grec, ill., 1 pl., in-4°. *E. Leroux*. 30 fr.

Euripide. Œuvres complètes, trad. par Leconte de Lisle. T. I, in-18. *A. Lemerre*. 3 fr. 50.

Havet (L.) Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins. Paris, 1911. 4°. 50 fr.

Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes, auctoritate et impensis academiae inscriptionum et litterarum humaniorum collectae et editae. Tomus IV. Asia, fasc. 3. Curavit R. Cagnat, auxiliante G. Lafaye. (S. 193-288). Lex. 8°. Paris, *E. Leroux*, 1910. nn 2.

Montelius (Osc.) La civilisation primitive en Italie depuis l'introduction des métaux. II^e partie. Italie centrale. Texte I. Stockholm und Berlin, 1910. Sp. 540-1024. Mit Abbildgn. 8°. 30 m.

Platon. Phédon; trad. de F. Thurot avec le texte grec par E. Sommer (199 pp.), in-16. *Hachette et C^{ie}*. 1 fr. 60.

Waddington (W. H.) E. Babelon et Th. Reinach. Recueil général des monnaies grecques d'Asie Mineure. T. I, fasc. 3. Nicée et Nicomédie, 84 pl., in-4°. *E. Leroux*. 40 fr.

GERMAN.

Arrian's Anabasis, in Auswahl v. Geo. Heldrich. 2 Tle. 8°. Wien, *M. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. geb. je 1.75. 1. Tl. Einleitung u. Text. (114 S.) 2. Tl. Erklärende Anmerkungen u. Wörterbuch. (134 S.)

Billeter (Gust.) Die Anschauungen vom Wesen des Griechentums. (xviii, 477 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 12; geb. in Leinw. 13.

Cicero's u. seiner Zeitgenossen ausgewählte Briefe. Bearb. u. f. die Schule erklärt v. Alois Kornitzer. (x, 118 u. 52 S.) 8°. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 2. 40.

Dietrich (Rud.) Collectanea zu Artemidorus Daldianus. 1. Tl. (20 S.) 8°. Rudolstadt, *Müller*, 1911. 1.

Διονυσίου ἡ Λογγίνου Περὶ ὑψους. Ed. Otto Iahn a. MDCCCLVII. Quartum ed. a. MDCCCX Ioa. Vahlen. (xxii, 94 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 2.80; geb. 3.20.

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. XVIII. gr. 8°. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. Pars 4. Ziemann (Ferd.) De epistularum graecarum formulis sollemnibus quaestiones selectae. (iii, vii u. S. 253-369.) 1911. 3.60.

— dasselbe. Vol. XX. gr. 8°. Ebd. Pars 1. Sittig (Ernest). De Graecorum nominibus theophoris. (xi, 167 S.) 1911. 5.

Euripides. Andromache. Mit erklär. Anmerkgn. v. N. Wecklein. (91 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 1.60; geb. 2.

Feyerabend (Karl). A pocket-dictionary of the Greek and English lan-

guages. 1. part. Greek-English. (xii, 419 S.) kl. 8°. Berlin-Schöneberg, *Langenscheidt's Verl.*, 1911. geb. in Leinw. 2.

Gall (Rob.) Lateinisches Lesebuch. 2 Tle. 8°. Wien, *F. Deuticke*. geb. in Leinw. 3.90.

Ganzenmüller (Carl). Die Elegie Nux u. ihr Verfasser. (87 S.) gr. 8°. Tübingen, *J. J. Heckenhauer*, 1910. 3.

Gruhn (Alb.) Der Schauplatz der Illas u. Odyssee. 10. Heft. Äolus, Lästrygonen, Kirke, Aïdes, Albanien. (248 S.) 1911. 6. Lex. 8°. Friedrichshagen-Berlin (Westend 5), *Selbstverlag*.

Harder (Christian). Lateinisches Lesebuch f. Realanstalten. 1. Tl. Text. 8°. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. geb. in Leinw. 2.

Klassiker des Altertums. 1. Reihe. München, *G. Müller*. 3. 4. Herodotus. 2 Bde. (vii, 408 u. v, 441 S.) 1911. Einzelpr. 10.

Kornitzer (Alois). Lateinisches Übungsbuch f. Obergymnasien. Umgearb. Aufl. (255 S.) 8°. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 3.

Leben, Antikes, in Briefen. Eine Auswahl aus der röm. Briefliteratur. Hrg. von Alex. v. Gleichen-Russwurm (ii, 380 S. m. 4 Bildnissen.) kl. 8°. Berlin, *J. Bard*, 1911. kart. 5; geb. in Ldr. n 7.

Livius. Auswahl aus der 3. Dekade. Bearb. v. Jhs. Teuffer. Text. (viii, 306 S. m. 4 farb. Karten.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. geb. in Halbleinw. 2.20.

Ludwich (Arth.) Anekdoten zur griechischen Orthographie. XII. Progr. (S. 341-372.) gr. 8°. Königsberg, *Akadem. Buchh. v. Schubert & Seidel*, 1911. b 35.

Nonni Panopolitani Dionysiaca. Recensuit Arth. Ludwich. Vol. II libros XXV-XLVIII continens. (iv, 556 S.) Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1911. 6.60; geb. in Leinw. 7.20.

Platon's Protagoras. Theaitetos. Ins Deutsche übertr. v. K. Preisendanz. (268 S.) 8°. Jena, *E. Diederichs*, 1910. 5; geb. n 6.50.

Plutarch. Auswahl, v. Herm. Schickinger. (2 Tle.) 2. Tl. Erklärende Anmerkgn. (192 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1911. geb. 1.50.

Poetae latini minores. Post Aem. Baehrens iterum recensuit Frider. Vollmer. Vol. II, fasc. 1. Ovidi halieuticon libri I fragmentum. Grattii cynegeticon libri I fragmentum. (58 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1911. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 60; geb. in Leinw. n 85.

Schroeder (Otto). Horazens Versmasse. (vi, 26 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 60.

Studien zur Geschichte u. Kultur des Altertums. gr. 8°. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*. IV. Bd. 3. Heft. Kessler (Jos.) Isokrates u. die panhellenische Idee. (86 S.) 1911. 2.60. IV. Bd. 4. Heft. Patin (Alois). Ästhetisch-kritische Studien zu Sophokles. (vii, 120 S.) 1911. 3.60.

Tacitus. Der Rednerdialog. Für den Schulge. hrsg. v. Herm. Röhl. 2 Tle. 8°. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1911. geb. je. 75. I. Text. (51 S.) II. Kommentar. (74 S.)

Teichmüller (Fd.) Das Nichthorazische in der Horazüberlieferung. Berlin, *E. Hofmann*, 1911. 8°. 304 pp. 6 m.

Traube (L.) Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen. 2. Bd. Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters. Herausg. von P. Lehmann. München, 1910. 8°. IX, 176 pp. 8 m.

Viedebantt (Osc.) Quaestiones Epiphanianae metrologicae et criticae. Leipzig, 1911. 8°. X, 140 pp. Mit. 6 Taf. 6 m.

Xenophon. Das Gastmahl. Verdeutsch von B. v. Hagen. (58 S. m. 1 Taf.) 8°. Jena, *E. Diederichs*, 1911. 2m.; geb. 8 m.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

About Edwin Drood. By H. J. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1911.

Aristophanes. Die Frösche. Mit ausgewählten antiken Schollen. Herausg. v. Wilhelm Süss. Kleine Texte für theologische u. philosophische Vorlesungen u. Uebungen. 66. Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber*, 1911. 2 m.

Baskervill (Charles Read). English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy. (Bulletin of the University of Texas; Humanistic Series, No. 12. Studies in English, No. 1.) Austin, Texas, *University of Texas*, April 8, 1911.

Blümner (Hugo). Die römischen Privat-Altertümer mit 86 Abbildungen (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft). Herausg. v. I. v. Müller. Vierter Bd. 2. Abt., 2. Teil. München, *Oskar Beck*, 1911. 12m..

Boas (Franz). Handbook of American Indian Languages. Part I. With illustrative sketches by Dixon, Goddard, Jones, Michelson, Thalbitzer. Smithsonian Institution (Bureau of American Ethnology). Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1911.

Burton (H. E.) A Latin Grammar. New York, *Silver, Burdett & Co.* 90 c.

Butler (N. M.) The Revolt of the Unfit. Reprinted from the Educational Review, February, 1911.

Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester. Vol. I. Literary Texts. Nos. 1-61. Ed. by Arthur S. Hunt. With ten plates. Manchester, *At the University Press*, 1911.

Columbia University Lectures. Lectures on Literature. New York, *Columbia University Press*: Sales Agents, Lemcke & Buechner, 1911.

Cornell Nepotis Vitae. Ed. Geo. Andresen. 2. Aufl. Für d. Schulgebr. bearb. v. R. Franz. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*: Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1908. Geb. 1 m. 20 pf.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Ed. consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis. Vol. LVII. S. Aurelii Augustini Operum Sectio II. S. Augustini Epistulae (Para. IV). Ex Recensione Al. Goldbacher. Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*: Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, MCCCXI. 21 m.

Demisch (Edwin). Die Schuldenerbfolge im attischen Recht. (Münchener diss.) Borna-Leipzig, *Robert Noske*, 1910.

Diehl (E.) Die Vitae Vergilianae u. ihre antiken Quellen. Herausg. v. E. D. (Kleine Texte 72.) Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber*, 1911. 1 m. 50 pf.

Dihigo (Juan M.) La fonetica experimental en la ciencia del lenguaje. Publicada en la Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias de la Universidad de Habana. Habana, 1911.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΥ Η ΛΟΓΙΤΙΝΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΥΨΟΥΣ. De Sublimitate libellus. In Usum Scholarum ed. O. Iahn. Quartum ed. Io. Vahlen. Lipsiae, *In Aedibus G. B. Teubner*, MDCCCXCI.

Dittmar (Armin). Syntaktische Grundfragen. Prog. No. 763, 1911. Grimmer, *Frdr. Bode*, 1911.

Eastern and Western Review. February, March, April, 1911. (Vol. III, Nos. 10-12. Per ann. \$1.) *Greek-American Publishing Co.*, Boston, Mass.

Edgerton (Franklin). The K-Suffixes of Indo-Iranian. (J. H. U. Diss.) Leipzig, *W. Drugulin*, 1911.

Ellis (Havelock). The World of Dreams. Boston and New York, *Houghton Mifflin Co.*, 1911. \$2.

English Dictionary, The Oxford. Ed. by Sir James A. H. Murray. Scouring-Sedum (Vol. VIII). By Henry Bradley. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*: New York, *Henry Frowde*. \$1.25.

Feyerabend (Karl). A Pocket Dictionary of the Greek and English Languages. First Part. Greek-English. Toussaint-Langenscheidt Method. Berlin, *Schöneberg-Langenscheidtsche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1910. 2 m.

Γαρδίκια (Γ. Κ.) Πραγματεία περὶ τῶν εἰς -ΙΚΟΣ ἐπιθέτων, περὶ τῶν εἰς ΙΟΝ καὶ ΕΙΩΝ οὐσιαστικῶν καὶ περὶ τῆς σημασίας καὶ τοῦ τύπου τοῦ ῥ. μελαγχολᾶν. Ἀνατύπωσις ἐκ τῆς Ἐπετηρίδος τοῦ Εθν. Πανεπιστημίου. ἐν Αθήναις. Σακελλάριος, 1910.

Gayley (Charles Miles). The Classic Myths in English Literature and Art, accompanied by an Interpretative and Illustrative commentary. New ed., Revised and Enlarged. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1911. \$1.60.

Harrington (K. P.) Live Issues in Classical Study. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1910. 75 c.

Harry (Joseph Edward). The Antigone of Sophocles. Translated into English Verse. Cincinnati, *The Robert Clarke Co.*, 1911. \$1.

Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Leo u. C. Robert. XLVI. Band, 2. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1911.

Heyse (Paul). L'Arrabbiata, Novelle. Ed. with Introductory Notes, Exercises, and a Vocabulary by Steven T. Byington. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1911. 30 c.

Hinke (W. J.) Selected Babylonian Kudurru Inscriptions. Semitic Study Series. No. XIV. Leiden, *E. J. Brill*: New York, *G. E. Stechert & Co.*, 1911.

Imagines Philologorum. 160 Bildnisse aus der Zeit von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart. Gesammelt u. herausg. v. Alfred Gudeman. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. Kart. 8 m. 20 pf.

Körner (Joseph). Nibelungenforschungen der deutschen Romantik. Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- u. Literaturgeschichte. Herausg. v. Oskar F. Walzel. N. F. IX Heft. Leipzig, *H. Haessel*, 1911.

Lateinisches Lesebuch für Realanstalten. Bearb. v. Christian Harder. 1. Teil. Text. Wien, *F. Tempsky*: Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. Geb. 2 m.

Lesebuch aus Platon. Mit einem Anhang aus Aristoteles. Für d. Schulgebr. herausg. v. Gustav Schneidewin. II. Erläuterungen. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. Geb. 1 m. 80 pf.

Marouzeau (S.) La phrase à verbe "être" en latin. Paris, *Paul Genthner*, 1910.

McBryde (John M.) Brer Rabbit in the Folk-Tales of the Negro and Other Races. Reprinted from the *Sewanee Review* for April, 1911. *Sewanee, Tenn., University Press*.

Μελέτη ('H.) Μηνιαίων δημοσίων, 'Ιαν. 1911. ἐν 'Αθήναις. @ 1 δρχ.

Mierow (C. C.) The Essentials of Latin Syntax. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1910. 90 c.

Migeod (F. W. H.) The Languages of West Africa. Volume 1. London, *Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.*, 1911. 12s. 6d.

Milhailearu (Petre). Fragmentele Latine ale lui Philumenus și Philagrius mit einer Vorrede: Die lateinischen Fragmente des Philumenus u. Philagrius. Bukarest, 1910.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. Hernard Gerth. Vierzehnter Jahrg. XXVII u. XXVIII. Bandes 3 Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911.

Nixon (Paul). A Roman Wit. Epigrams of Martial rendered into English by Paul Nixon. Boston, *Houghton, Mifflin Co.*, 1911.

Oliphant (S. G.) An Interpretation of Ranae 788-90. Reprinted from the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. XL, 1909.

Owen (E. I.) The Relations Expressed by the Passive Voice. Reprinted from Vol. XVII, Part 1, of the *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters*, July, 1910.

Pascal (Carlo) Epicurei e Mistici. Catania, *Francesco Battiato*, 1911. 2 L.

Petronius. The Bellum Civile. Ed. with Introduction, Commentary, and Translation by Florence Theodora Baldwin. New York, *The Columbia University Press: Lemcke & Buechner*, 1911.

Poetarum Romanorum Veterum Reliquiae: Selegit E. Diehl. (Kleine Texte, 69.) Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber*, 1911. 2 m. 50 pf.

Πρακτικά τῆς ἐν 'Αθήναις 'Αρχαιολογικῆς 'Εταιρείας τοῦ ἔτους 1909. 'Αθήνησιν, 1910.

Reay (Lord). The Late President, Mr. S. H. Butcher, M. P. From the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. V.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias, Universidad de la Habana. Noviembre de 1910. Vol. XI. Num. 3. Enero de 1911. Vol. XII. Num. 1.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von August Brinkmann. N. F. LXVI 1. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerlander's Verlag*, 1911.

Schanz (Martin). Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. Zweiter Teil. Die römische Litteratur in der Zeit der Monarchie bis auf Hadrian, Erste Hälfte: Die augustische Zeit. Dritte, gänzl. umgearbeitete u. verm. Auflage. (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausg. v. I. v. Müller. Achter Bd. Zweiter Teil. 2. Abt. 1. Hälfte.) München, *Oskar Beck*, 1911. 10 m.

Scheindlers Lateinische Uebungsbücher für die II. klasse der Realgymnasien u. Gymnasien. Von Aug. Scheindler. Wien, *F. Tempsky*: Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. 2 m. 60 pf.

Scheindler (Aug.) Lateinische Schulgrammatik. Herausg. v. R. Kauer. 8te Ausg. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1910.

Schiller's Wilhelm Tell. Ed. with Introduction, Notes and Repetitional Exercises by Bert John Vos. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1911.

Semple (William S.) Authenticity and Sources of the Origo Gentis Romanae. University Studies, Series II, Vol. VI, No. 3. Cincinnati, *University Press*, Sept., Oct., 1910.

Shewan (Alexander). The Lay of Dolon (The Tenth Book of the Illad). Some Notes on its Language, Verse and Contents. With Remarks by the way on the Canons and Methods of Homeric Criticism. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1911. \$3.25.

Sihler (E. G.) Annals of Caesar. New York, *Stechert & Co.*, 1911. \$1.75.

Skeat (Walter W.) A Concise Etymological Dictionary. New and Corrected Edition. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1911. 5s.

Sophokles' Philoktetes von Friedrich Schubert. Dritte gänzl. umgearbeitete Aufl. v. L. Hüter. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*: Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1908. Geb. 1 m. 20 pf.

Steele (R. B.) UT, NM, QVIN and QUOMINUS in Livy. Leipzig, *Brockhaus*, 1911.

Steiner u. Scheindler's Lateinisches Lese- u. Uebungsbuch. III u. IV Teil. Herausg. v. R. Kauer. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1910. Geb. @ 2 kr.

Tacitus, Der Rednerdialog. Für d. Schulgebr. herausg. v. H. Röhl. I. Teil: Der Text. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*: Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1911. 75 pf.

Valentini (R.) Di un' Antologia Valerio-Gelliana del sec. XII. Estr. Riv. Classici e Neolatini, n. 4. a. VI, 1910. Aosta, *Marguerretaz*, 1910.

Wagenwoort (H.) De Horatii quae dicuntur odis Romanis. (Spec. Inaug.) Groningae, MCMXI.

Wright (F. Warren). Studies in Menander. (Princeton Diss.) Bryn Mawr, The Author, 1911. \$1.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXII, 3.

WHOLE No. 127.

I.—THE HOUSE-DOOR IN GREEK AND ROMAN RELIGION AND FOLK-LORE.

The important part which the threshold and the house-door play in the folk-lore and religion of various peoples¹ led me to inquire whether they were of equal importance among the Greeks and Romans. I have collected, therefore, what is, I trust, a fairly complete list of references in Greek and Latin literature to superstitions connected with the threshold and the door. The references show that the most prominent belief in connection with them was that spirits haunted their vicinity. A theory, then, which will logically account for the presence of these spirits should furnish a simple and sufficient explanation for the important character of the door-way in religion and folklore.

One of the most common² superstitions connected with the threshold is that to stumble thereon betokens bad luck. This belief was current among the Romans and, I believe, among the Greeks also, although the evidence in the case of the latter is scanty. There is recorded a saying of Pythagoras³ that "If you

¹ Cf. especially Trumbull, *The Threshold Covenant*, and the references cited below.

² For this superstition among other peoples, cf. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 12 sq.; Brand, *Pop. Antiq. Index*, s. v. *Stumbling*; Aubrey, *Remaines of Gentil. and Judaisme*, ed. Britten, Lond., 1881, p. 56; Winternitz, *Denkschr. Wien. Akad. d. Wiss.* XL, 1892, p. 71; Haltrich, *Volkskund. d. Siebenburg. Sachsen*, p. 316; Wuttke, *Deutsch. Volksab.*, pp. 396; 471; Conder, *Heth and Moab*, pp. 293-4; Marco Polo, *Bk. II*, ch. 13, with Yule's note, vol. I, pp. 341 sq.

³ Mullach, *Fr. Gr. Phil.* 2, p. 510; cf. Frazer, *Folk-Lore Jour.* (London), I, p. 156. These words of Pythagoras do not necessarily prove that this superstition was Greek; it may have been Italic.

stumble upon the threshold on going out, you should turn back"; and Plut. refers to the same belief in the life of Demetrius as well as in the lives of the Romans, Ti. Gracchus and Crassus :

Demetr. 29, 2 : Ἀντίγονος δὲ . . ἐξιών προσέπταισεν ὥστε πεσεῖν . . ἀναστὰς δὲ . . ἠτήσατο νίκην παρὰ τῶν θεῶν.

Tiber. Gracch. 17, 3 : πρὶν ἐξελθεῖν προσέπταισε πρὸς τὸν οὐδὸν σφοδρᾶς οὕτω πληγῆς γενομένης ὥστε τὸν μὲν ὄνυχα . . ῥαγῆναι.

Cras. 17, 6 : ἐξιόντων γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ πρῶτος ἐσφάλῃ κατὰ τὰς πύλας ὁ νεανίας Κράσσοι, εἴτ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ περιπεσὼν ὁ πρεσβύτερος.

In Roman literature we find the following references to this omen :

Cic. de div. 2, 40, 84 : quae si suscipiamus, pedis offensio nobis et abruptio corrigiae et sternumenta erunt observanda. And so Pl. N. H. 2, 24 puts "offensiones pedum"¹ among omens.

Tibull. 1, 3, 19 : quotiens ingressus iter mihi tristia dixi/offensum in porta signa dedisse pedem.

Id. 1, 7, 62 : te canit agricola e magna cum venerit urbe/serus inoffensum rettuleritque pedem.

Ov. Am. 1, 12, 3 : omina sunt aliquid. Modo cum discedere vellet/ad limen digitos restitit icta Nape.

Id. Her. 13, 85 : cum foribus velles ad Troiam exire paternis/pes tuus offenso limine signa dedit.

Id. Trist. 3, 4, 33 : nam pede inoffenso spatium decurrere vitae/dignus es et fato candidiore frui.

Id. M. 10, 452 : ter pedis offensi signo est revocata, ter omen/funereus bubo letali carmine fecit ; cf. Trist. 1, 3, 55.

Verg. Aen. 2, 242 seems to have had the same idea in mind when he says of the wooden horse : quater ipso in limine portae/substitit atque utero sonitum quater arma dedere.

Valer. Max. 1, 4, 2 : Ti. Gracchus . . . auspicia . . . petiit, quae illi perquam tristia responderunt : et ianua egressus ita pedem offendit ut digitus ei decuteretur. This incident is also referred to by Plut. Ti. Gr. 17, 3 (cf. above), and Jul. Obs. 86.

Petron. 132 : podagrici pedibus suis maledicunt, chiragrici manibus, lippi oculis et qui offenderunt saepe digitos, quidquid doloris habent, in pedes deferunt. There are also two other

¹Stumbling elsewhere than on the threshold seems to have been a bad omen ; cf. Eurip. Heracl. 730 ; Valer. Max. 1, 5, 2, of Camillus : subito lapso decedit, quod omen ad damnationem qua postea oppressus est ; ib. 1, 6, 6 ; Suet. Caes. 59 ; August. de doct. christ. 2, 20, 31.

passages which may refer to this belief, but their fragmentary condition renders a definite decision impossible:

Novius, Macc. Ex. fr. 2 (Ribb. 2, p. 262): *limen superum quod mei misero saepe confregit caput/inferum autem digitos omnis ubi ego defregi meos.*

Petron. 138: *evasi tamen omnibus digitis inter praecipitem decursum cruentatis.*

To prevent the bride from stumbling on the threshold and thus to avoid the bad omen is one of the reasons given by the ancients to explain the Roman¹ custom of lifting her over the threshold of her husband's house. This custom is referred to by the following writers:

Plaut. Cas. 815: *super attolle limen pedes mea nova nupta: sospes iter incipe hoc ut viro tuo semper sis superstes.*

Varro ap. Serv. Verg. Ecl. 8, 29: (sponsas) *ideo limen ait non tangere ne a sacrilegio inchoarent si depositurae virginitatem calcent rem Vestae, i. e. numini castissimo consecratam.* For the latter statement, cf. Myth. Vat. 3, 12, 2; Serv. Aen. 2, 467; 6, 273.

Catull. 61, 166: *transfer omine cum bono/limen aureolos pedes.*

Luc. Phar. 2, 359: *turritaque premens frontem matrona corona/tralata vetuit contingere limina planta.*

Isid. Or. 9, 7, 12: *uxores dictae quasi unxiores: quae ideo vetebantur limina calcare quod illic ianuae et coeant et separantur* (cf. Ellis' note on Catull., l. 1.).

Plut. Rom. Quaes. 29: *διὰ τί τὴν γαμουμένην οὐκ ἔωσιν αὐτὴν ὑπερβῆναι τὸν οὐδὸν τῆς οἰκίας, ἀλλ' ὑπεραίρουσιν οἱ προπέμποντες;*

Id. Romul. 15, 5: *διαμένει δὲ μέχρι νῦν τὸ τὴν νύμφην αὐτὴν ἀφ' αὐτῆς μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν τὸν οὐδὸν εἰς τὸ δωμάτιον.*

Modern authorities² are inclined to adopt this explanation of the ancients and surely the analogous practices of other peoples would seem to point to the avoidance of the bad omen of stumb-

¹ So among the ancient Hindoos a bride was forbidden to stand on the threshold; cf. Grihya Sutras, Sacr. Bks. of the East, XXX, pp. 193, 263; and lifting the bride is common in many parts of the world; cf. Trumbull, op. cit., pp. 36 sq.

² Adopted by Bekker Gall.³ 2, pp. 26, 46; Crooke, The Lifting of the Bride, F-L Jour. 13, 1902, pp. 238 sq.; Prel.-Jord. R. M. 2, 217; Winternitz, l. 1; Eitrem, Hermes u. die Toten, p. 14. The other view suggested by Plut., l. 1., that the custom was a survival typifying the capture of the bride is defended by Rossbach, Röm. Ehe, p. 359; but cf. Marq.-Momm. Privatl., p. 55, n. 11.

ling as the main motive; we are safe, at least, in concluding that upon the threshold¹ lurked some danger to the bride, danger which she could escape by not treading thereon.²

What, then, is the explanation of this dangerous character of the threshold, emphasized as it is by the bad omen of stumbling upon it as well as by the necessity of lifting the bride over it? In the case of other peoples the explanation is clearly to be found in the idea that spirits haunted the vicinity of the house-door; and if it can be shown that this idea was current among the Greeks and Romans also, the same explanation surely will suffice. That it was, is seen from the fact that beneath the threshold, or on the door, were placed prophylactic substances to protect the house from evil spirits, and that the threshold, or the vicinity of the door, was the place for performing all sorts of magic rites, which are, in the last analysis, generally concerned with the spirits of the dead.

We read in Pl. N. H. 29, 67: *draconis caput limini ianuarum subditum propitiatis dis*³ *fortunatam domum facere promittitur*; and again, 30, 82: *contra omnia mala medicamenta, item sanguinem canis respersis parietibus genitaleque eius sub limine ianuae defossum*. Likewise in Geop. 15, 8, 1, *μελισσῶν σμήνη μὴ φαρμακοῦσθαι*, Leontinus recommends that the right hoof of a black ass be buried under the threshold of the hive, and sprinkled over with pine-resin, salt, cumin, sea-onion, and among other things, the

¹ In modern Greece, the bride is lifted over the threshold to keep from stumbling upon it, which is considered bad luck; Wachsmuth, *Das alte Gr. im neuen*, p. 97. Among the Manchus the bride is carried into the groom's house in a sedan chair, after crackers have been fired before the door to drive away spirits; F-L Jour. 1, p. 487. In the Punjab, small bundles of cotton are laid upon the threshold, on which the bride steps as she crosses it, *ib.* 9 (1898), p. 153; among the western Somali tribes a sacrifice of a goat or a sheep is made on the threshold, and the bride steps over it as she enters; a similar custom is recorded of the Bedouins; cf. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins*, p. 151; cf. also F-L Jour. 1, p. 459. Other examples in Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 36 sq.

² Whether this idea gave rise to the custom of crossing the threshold with the right foot (Petron. 30), is doubtful; the right foot was the proper one to start with not only when about to enter a house or temple (cf. Verg. A. 8, 302; Iambl. V. Py. 28, 156), but when beginning a journey (cf. Juv. 10, 5; Apul. M. 1, 5; Hor. Ep. 2, 2, 37), and even, according to Pythagoras (Iambl. V. Py. 18), when putting on shoes.

³ By "dis" we are to understand chthonic powers, if Pliny did not; cf. *ib.* 25, 50 with 25, 109 and Theophr. h. pl. 9, 8, 7.

πανσπερμία. Colum. 7, 5, 17 advises that when a flock of sheep is suffering from disease, one of them should be buried alive in a ditch dug on the threshold, and the rest of the flock driven over it. In a fragment of Aristoph. Dan. 255 K, a sea-onion is buried under the threshold, and according to Pl. N. H. 20, 101, Pythagoras recommended the same means for preventing "malorum medicamentorum introitum";¹ Dios. 2, 202 describes this plant as ἀλεξιφάρμακον ὅλην πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν κρεμαμένη, cf. Geop. 15, 1, 31: πάντα φθόγον καὶ ἐπιβουλήν ἐλαύνει . . ἡ σκίλλα ξηραινομένη, καὶ ἐν τῷ προθύρῳ τῆς οἰκίας κειμένη. During the Greek Anthesteria, when the spirits of the dead were about,² and at the time of child-birth, when also danger was feared from them,³ the Athenian anointed his doors with pitch and chewed buckthorn,⁴—a plant which was also hung before house-doors "to repel the evil arts of the magicians", Dios. 1, 119, and as an aid against φάρμακα καὶ φαντάσματα, Schol. Nicand. Ther. 860. The same ideas led the Roman to strike his door-posts and threshold thrice with branches of the arbuté-tree in order to keep out "striges" (Ov. F. 6, 155); and to hang a frog on the door of the granary for the protection of the grain (Pl. 18, 303). Pliny, 29, 83, also tells us that a bat serves as an amulet if hung by its feet to the lintel of the sheep-fold; and again (32, 44), that the "stella marina", if smeared with the blood of a fox and fastened by an iron nail to the lintel of the door, prevents the entry of "mala medicamenta". For a similar reason,—"*ne quid mali medicamenti inferretur*"—it was the custom for newly-wedded brides to anoint the door-posts with wolf's fat (Pl. 28, 142; cf. ib. 28, 135). Pliny likewise states, in writing of the virtues of iron (34, 151), that nails⁵ torn from graves and fastened to the threshold have power against "nocturnæ lymphationes"; and (28, 85), that the tricks of the Magi are brought to naught "*tactis—menstruo⁶ postibus*"; the

¹ Similarly in Szekely lore, cows are thought to be protected against witchcraft by placing garlic over the door or into a hole in the threshold; cf. F-L Jour. 21, 1884, p. 104; also pp. 330-331. ² Cf. Rohde, Psy. 1, p. 237.

³ Cf. Pl. N. H. 28, 247 sq.; August. de civ. dei 6, 9.

⁴ Cf. Phot. s. v. Μιαρὰ ἡμέρα and ῥάμνος; Rohde, l. l., n. 3; Harrison, Prol., p. 39; Samter, Familienf., p. 113; Eitrem, op. cit., p. 22.

⁵ For nails in magic, cf. Pl. 26, 24; 28, 46; Pallad. 4, 10, 4. The fact that these were taken from a grave added to their power; cf. Pl. 28, 140; 226; Apul. M. 3, 17; cf. Theocr. 5, 121; Ov. Her. 6, 89; Prop. 4, 5, 29.

⁶ For this as prophylactic, cf. Pl. 28, 77 sq.; Frazer, Golden Bough 1, 170; 2, 225 sq.

same end was also gained,—28, 104,—by affixing a mixture of barley and blood to the posts. In order to turn all men's hatred against an enemy, says Pl. 28, 117, the intestines of a chameleon should be mixed with monkey's urine and affixed to his door. The same authority also tells us,—28, 86,—that if a person, who is suffering from fever, fastens the clippings from his finger and toe nails to another's door, the ailment will be transferred to him. On the door, too, were written magic verses to keep out weasels (Geop. 13, 15, 8), the word Ἀδάμ to keep serpents away (Geop. 13, 8, 4; 14, 5), and the words "arse verse"¹ to protect the house from fire. So the ill-omened birds that fly in the night were hung on the door to protect the house from lightning (Colum. de cult. hort. 346; Pallad. 1, 35, 1), or as Apul. (M. 3, 23) puts it: "ut quod infaustis volatibus familiae minantur exitium, suis luant cruciatibus". In like manner, when a hail-storm threatened, a crocodile's skin was hung up at the entrance of the house (Pallad. 1, 35, 14; Geop. 1, 14, 5).² And the same ideas prompted the inhabitants of the early cities of Greece and Italy to sculpture phalli on the lintel of the city gates.³ The custom, too, of having the threshold of bronze⁴ may have been due to the belief in the prophylactic properties of this metal.⁵

In the case of many of these practices it may be objected that the prophylactic substance was hung before the door because through the door the powers of ill would enter no matter whence they came; thus in Ovid F. 6, 165 spina alba is placed in the window to keep out the striges, after the door-posts and the threshold have been struck thrice with branches of the arbutus

¹ Cf. Otto, Sprichw. n. 172; Riess, Art. Aberglaube, Pauly-Wiss. 1.

² This custom of placing prophylactic substances under the threshold or on the door is common among all peoples, and numerous examples are cited by Trumbull, op. cit., pp. 14 sq. Among the Magyars a love charm consists in burying "three beans and three bulbs of garlic and a few pieces of dried coal and a dead frog" under the threshold, Jones and Kropfs, Folk-Tales of the Magyars, p. 332; cf. Turner, Samoa, pp. 21, 56 sq.; Jour. Am. F-L. 12, 126. In ancient Assyria amulets with curses and charms upon them were buried beneath the threshold, Maspero, Life in Anc. Egypt and Assyria, pp. 195, 219.

³ Cf. Dennis, Cit. and Cem. of Etrur. 2, 109.

⁴ Paus. 9, 19, 7; cf. Hom. Od. 7, 83 sq.; cf. the threshold of the various entrances to Hades, at Kolonos, e. g., Soph. O. C. 56 sq. and Gruppe, G. M. 895, n. 1.

⁵ Cf. Arch. f. Religionsw. 10, 1907, p. 41.

tree, and the door-way has been sprinkled with water,—methods, clearly, of riddance. In the following examples, however, there is no question of the spirits entering the house, but only of the necessity for their presence that the magic rite may be effective. In the love charm in Theocr. 2, 59 sq. the magic herbs are smeared on the threshold, and in the corresponding passage in Vergil's 8th Ecl. vs. 93, the garments left behind by the fickle Daphnis, "dear pledges of himself", are buried under the threshold. According to Ps.-Theod. Prisc. Add., p. 281, 22 (Rose), *canis numquam rabiet in domo, si pellem canis rabiosi sub limen obliques vel in porta figas*. With these passages may be compared Pap. Mag. Mus. Lugd. Bat. J. 384, III, 1 (Dieterich, p. 799): *Ἐργαστήριον εὖ πράσσειν. ἐπὶ φῶν ὄρνιθος ἀρσενικοῦ ἐπίγραφε καὶ κατόρυξον πρὸς τὸν οὐδόν . . . ἦδε εὐχή τοῦ φῶν· ὁ μέγας θεός, δός μοι χάριν, πρᾶξιν καὶ τόπων τούτων, ὅπου κεῖται τὸ φόν, ἐν ᾧ οἶκός πραγατεύομαι*. Hence the threshold plays a very prominent part in medicinal lore. We read in Marc. Emp. 2, 4: *emicranium statim curant vermes terreni*¹ *pari numero sinistra manu lecti et in limine cum terra de limine eadem manu triti et cum aceto optimo eadem manu fronti vel temporibus inliti*. In other cases the patient must be standing on or near the threshold² when he takes the magic remedy, as in Marc. Emp. 14, 66: *picem mollem cerebro eius inpone, qui uvam dolebit, praecipe ut super limen stans superiori limini ipsam picem capite suo adfigat*; ib. 16, 21: *ieiunus*—*per dies continuos novem in limine stans bibe*; ib. 23, 35, for disorders of the spleen, a person is to drink *ebuli radicem, quam sine ferro evellas, in limine stans contra orientem per triduum ieiunus*, cf. Ps.-Theod. Prisc. Add., p. 324, 5. Similarly in 4, 27, a person who is to take a concoction used to cure porrigo, *supra limen adsistat idque triduo faciat*. Ps.-Theod. Prisc. Add., p. 345, 14: *ut cito pariat mulier, scribes in limine superiore ostii Oceanum interea surgens Aurora reliquit*; ib. 323, 27: *lacertam viridem in vase fictili novo mittes, et per medium limen pendeat, ubi spleniticus manet, et condes*. *Dum exit sive ingreditur, idem vas tangat mox ab eo morbo libera-*

¹ Earth-worms were commonly used as a remedy, cf. Marc. Emp. 9, 64; 84; 108; 14, 23 sq.

² So in Tuscany at the present time, folk remedies are taken on the threshold; cf. Leland, *Etruscan Roman Remains in Popular Tradition*, pp. 282, 321.

bitur.¹ The hinge, also, and other parts of the door were used in similar practices. Marc. Emp. 1, 65: *glebularum de limine vel ipso cardine erasas cum aceto simul permisce eoque luto frontem inline, quo caput confestim gravissimo dolore relevabis.* So Pl. 28, 49, recommends the dirt from the door-hinges for headache. Marc. Emp. 28, 37: *ad ventris dolorem remedium efficax sic: sordes de cardine ostii tolle digitis duobus, pollice et medicinali, et super umbilicum laborantis adpone.* Ib. 17, 48, *ad reumaticos: sordium aut pulveris . . . in foramine, in quo ianuae pessuli descendunt, quidquid reppereris collige . . . et tacite vel occulto loco in potionem aut cibum . . . insperge.* The key also was prophylactic; cf. Geop. 1, 14, 6: *εἰ δὲ καὶ κλειδιά πολλὰ διαφόρων οἰκημάτων κύκλῳ τοῦ χωρίου ἐν σχοινοῖς ἀπαρτήσεις, παρελεύσεται ἡ χάλαζα.* And through the key-hole² Hermes makes his way in Hom. Hy. 3, 146. The presence of spirits around the door-way is distinctly implied, moreover, in a practice described by Ps.-Apul. de virt. herb. 7: *si quis devotatus defixusque fuerit in suis nuptiis sic eum resolves; herbae pedis leonis frutices numero septem sine radicibus decoque cum aqua, luna decrescente, lavato eum, et te ipsum qui facis, ante limen extra domum prima nocte, et herbam incende aristolochiam et suffumigato eum et redito ad domum et ne post vos respiciatis, resolvisti eum.* The warning "Look not behind you" is an invariable sign³ of the presence of spirits, for it was dangerous even to catch sight of them. Similar evidence is furnished by a passage in Pl. 20, 6, where he writes: *putant . . . adiuvari . . . partus . . . si in arietis lana adligatum (elaterium)*

¹ Although many of these practices seem to rest upon the common folk belief that diseases can be transferred to objects which are brought into contact with the patient, this idea alone will not explain why the threshold should be chosen as the place where the object should be buried, or where the magic rite should be performed. The Law of Sympathy requires simply that such an object should be buried, so that, as it decays, sickness may cease. Nor can we say that in the practice quoted from the Additamenta the vase was suspended from the lintel because the patient would touch it, on this account, most frequently; cf. the English custom of driving a nail in the lintel to cure toothache, F-L Jour. 6, 1895, p. 158.

² Cf. Hom. Od. 4, 802 where the *εἰδῶλον ἐς θάλαμον δ' εἰσῆλθε παρὰ κληίδος ἱμάντα*. Cf. Gruppe, G. M. 1295, n. 3; Eitrem, op. cit., 37-8. He compares the German saying (Wuttke², D. V., § 297; § 753): "Wenn ein Schlüssel aus dem Thürschloss fällt, sterbe jemand im Hause".

³ Cf. Theocr. 24, 94; Ap. Rh. 3, 1039; Ov. F. 5, 443 sq.; Pl. 29, 91; Eustath. ad Hom. Od. 22, 481, p. 1934-5; Rohde, Psy. 2, 85.

inscientis lumbis fuerit, ita ut protinus ab enixu rapiatur extra domum. The last words can only mean that the remedy was thought of as a purificatory substance which, as often, was thrown out as an offering to the spirits of the dead.¹ This may explain why in Philostr. vit. Ap. 3, 39, 2, a hare which was used at the same critical moment had to be carried quickly without the door.² St. August. de civ. dei 6, 9, quoting Varro, has preserved for us another interesting practice in connection with child-birth: mulieri fetae post partum tres deos commemorat adhiberi, ne Silvanus deus per noctem ingrediatur et vexet, eorumque custodum significandorum causa tres homines noctu circumire limina domus et primo limen securi ferire, postea pilo, tertio deverrere scopis. With this use of the broom we may compare the custom of sweeping out a house after a corpse had been removed;³ the mortar,⁴ and doubtless the pestle, also, and the axe⁵ were both prophylactic and occur in other folk practices. There are, further, two passages in Ovid which clearly illustrate this idea that spirits haunted the vicinity of the threshold; in Met. 7, 235 sq., when Medea is making her preparations to rejuvenate Aeson, constitit adveniēns citra limenque foresque, / et tantum caelo tegitur: . . . statuitque aras e caespite binas / dexteriore Hecates, ast laeva parte Iuventae. / . . . haud procul egesta scrobibus tellure duabus / sacra facit, cultrosque in guttura velleris⁶ atri / conicit, et patulas perfundit sanguine fossas.⁶ In Met. 9, 295 sq., when Alcmene narrates her sufferings at the birth of Hercules, she tells how Juno subsedit in illa / ante fores ara, dextroque a poplite laevum / pressa genu et digitis inter se pectine iunctis / sustinuit partus. tacita quoque carmina voce / dixit, et incoeptos tenuerunt carmina partus.⁷ We may also note

¹ Cf. Rohde, Psy. 2, 79, and n. 1.

² The reason given is: *ξυνεκδοθῆναι ἂν τῷ ἐμβρύῳ τὴν μήτραν*.

³ Cf. Paul. ex Fest., p. 77; Prel.-Jord. R. M. 1, 377; 2, 93.

⁴ For the mortar, cf. Cato de agr. cult. 127; an interesting parallel among the people of the island of Thanet, cf. F-L Jour. 5, 1894, p. 23. For the axe, cf. Pallad. 1, 35, 1; it was also used in divination, *ἀξινομαντεία*; Pl. 30, 14; cf. the *δλμος*, Aristoph. Vesp. 201, 238 and Schol.; Zenob. 3, 63.

⁵ For the ram as spirit offering, cf. Dion. Hal. A. R. 4, 22; Frazer on Paus. 5, 13, 2; 9, 39, 6.

⁶ Offerings to the dead were commonly made in a ditch; cf. Hom. Od. 11, 24 sq.; Stat. Theb. 4, 559; 11, 63; cf. below.

⁷ For this belief, cf. Pl. 28, 59; and 28, 42.

Ovid's statement, *Met.* 11, 605, concerning the palace of Somnus: *ante fores antri fecunda papavera florent/innumeraeque herbae, quarum de lacte soporem/Nox legit et spargit per opacas umida terras.* One of the charges which Apuleius refutes in his *Apology* (58), is that in the vestibule of a house rented by a friend of his, whom he often visited, were found quantities of bird feathers, and the walls were blackened by smoke,—facts which his accusers asserted were evidence of his "*nocturna sacra*". It may be noted, too, that just as the threshold was the proper seat in Hades of the Furies,¹ so when they visited the living, they took their seat upon the threshold; the *Dirae* in *Verg. Aen.* 4, 473; *Allecto* in *Aen.* 7, 343; *Tisiphone* in *Ov. Met.* 4, 485; cf. *Stat. Theb.* 5, 69. When there was danger of pollution, too, the threshold was washed with water, as in *Ov. Fast.* 6, 155 sq., when the house is purified after the entrance of the "*striges*". And *Prop.* 4, 8, 84, represents *Cynthia* as washing the threshold with pure water after the visit upon him of the two "*ladies of easy virtue*". It was "*in limine sacro*" also, that the inhabitants of *Egnatia* tried to persuade *Horace* and his companions (*S.* 1, 5, 99), that incense would burn without fire.² It is important to note, also, that it was "*ad limina*" that the *Penates* appeared to *Aeneas* when they, bearing *Apollo's* message, bade him leave *Crete* for the West (*Verg. A.* 3, 155). Similarly *Helenus* stands "*ad limina*" when he makes his prophecy to *Aeneas* (*ib.* 3, 371); and the *Sibyl* is before the threshold of her cave when she receives the divine inspiration (*ib.* 6, 45; cf. 115; 151). *Ovid*, *F.* 3, 358, also tells us that *Numa* and his people took their stand "*ante limina regis*" when at sunrise³ they were awaiting omens from *Jupiter*. Perhaps these passages may serve to explain *Hom. Od.* 8, 80: *ὅς γάρ οἱ <᾿Αγαμέμνονι> χρείων μυθήσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων/Πυθοῖ ἐν ἡγαθέῃ ὅθ' ὑπέρβη λαῖνον οὐδὸν/χρησόμενος.* The expression can hardly mean simply, "he entered the temple".

¹ Cf. *Verg. Aen.* 6, 555; *Ov. Met.* 4, 453 sq.; cf. *Gruppe*, *G. M.* 405.

² Cf. *Pl.* 2, 240, who, however, says nothing of a threshold. For attempts at explanation, cf. *Macleane's* note. The point here is that the "*sacrum limen*" was chosen as the spot to perform the miracle.

³ The early morning was the favorite time for the performance of magic rites; cf. *Pl.* 29, 85, 91; *Riess*, *Pauly-Wiss.* 1, 38 sq. In *Sicily* it is still the custom to go out before the house-door on the first Monday of the month to take auguries; cf. *Pitré*, *Tradiz. Sicil.* 17, p. 253.

These citations would seem to indicate that the threshold was thought to be the source of prophetic inspiration, and we may compare the familiar grave-oracles (Rohde, *Psy.* 1, 186 sq.), and the belief that the spirits of the dead foretold the future (cf. Herod. 4, 149; 5, 92, 7; Plat. *Leg.* 10, 909 B; Verg. *A.* 10, 33; Diog. Laert. 8, 1, 32; August. *de civ. dei* 7, 35). It is, moreover, only by reference to this belief in the presence of spirits round the door-way, that we can explain the Roman custom of laying the dying before the door (Serv. ad *Aen.* 12, 395). *Ut extremum spiritum redderent terrae* is Servius' explanation, but they were laid before the door and not elsewhere,¹ as is the custom among other peoples, because here was the haunt of spirits, especially, as I shall try to point out below, of the family spirits.

To be mentioned here is the custom referred to by Hesych. s. v. *ᾠπωτήρη*: *διὰ φαρμάκων εἰώθασί τινες ἐπάγειν τὴν Ἑκάτην ταῖς οἰκίαις, πῦρ πρὸ θυρῶν*, with which may be compared id. s. v. *ᾠπι* *ἄνασσα*, *πυρρὰ πρόθυρος πῦρ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν*. Bergk, *PLG* 3, p. 682, by supposing that these passages really belong together, thinks that they refer to a custom described by Theodoret. 1, 352, ed. Sirmond, according to whom it was a yearly practice in some cities to light fires in the streets through which men and boys leaped, and even small children were carried for the purposes of purification. This makes the rite comparable to the fire ceremonies which are common in various parts of the world.² This may be correct, but it is sufficient for my purpose to take the statements of Hesychius as they stand: that at times fires were built before the house-doors and Hecate invoked,³ proof enough that we are dealing with spirits.⁴ If Opis = Artemis,—and of their close relationship there can be no doubt,⁵—and if Opis, as Hesychius implies, was, like Hecate, concerned in the above rite, the fact furnishes further evidence of the connection of

¹ Cf. Mau, *Pauly-Wiss.* 3, 347. Remarking that Serv. explanation is correct, he adds: "nur dass deshalb der Sterbende nicht gerade vor die Thür gelegt zu werden brauchte". Parallel practices in Dieterich, *Mutter Erde*, pp. 26 sq.

² Cf. Gruppe, *Gr. M.* 892, n. 4.

³ In Lucian, *Necyom.* 9, the Magus holds a burning torch when he invokes Hecate. Torches hung on door at wedding, Bion 1, 88.

⁴ For Hecate in connection with magic, cf. Steuding, *Roscher's Lex.* 1, 1894.

⁵ Cf. Crusius, *R. Lex.* 1, 2811 sq.; Höfer, *ib.* 3, 927 sq.

Hecate and Artemis with each other and with the house-door.¹ Their statues were set up in front of it² and both bore the name Prothyraia.³ We may suppose, too, that before these statues of Hecate, as before those on the cross-roads, were cast the remains, as offerings, of substances which had been used in purificatory ceremonies.⁴ Similarly statues of Hermes were set up on the cross-roads and before doors, which as Hermes Strophaios or Thyraios,⁵ he protected and from which he kept out ill.⁶ The same is true also of the conical pillars of Apollo Agyieus, and this god likewise bore the name Thyraios.⁷ In Rome, also, the threshold had its protecting deities, Janus, Forculus, Limentinus, Cardea, and others.⁸ The Lares afford even a closer parallel to these Greek gods, for their statues were likewise set up on the cross-roads⁹ and, although in the family cult, they were commonly placed within the house near the hearth, we have plenty of evidence to show that they were also placed at the entrance to the house.¹⁰

These facts are sufficient surely to warrant the conclusion that round the threshold spirits were thought to gather,—a belief to which the superstitions of many peoples furnish striking analogies.¹¹ They point, moreover, to an evident connection between

¹ Cf. Roscher's *Lex.* I, 571 sq.; 781 sq.; Gruppe, *Gr. M.* 1289, n. 2.

² Cf. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 804; Aeschyl. fr. 378 N; Gruppe, *Gr. M.* 1289, n. 2.

³ Cf. Hesych. s. v. *ἐκάταα*; Orph. *hy.* 2, 12; Gruppe 1296, n. 1.

⁴ Cf. Phot. s. v. *ὀξυθύμα*; Rohde, *Psy.* 2, 79, n. 1; Steuding, l. l., 1889; cf. above, p. 258. Suggestive is Stat. *Theb.* 9, 818: *cultus Triviae pendebitis alto/limine, captivis matrem donabo pharetris.*

⁵ Cf. *R. Lex.* I, 2382; Gruppe, 1337, n. 6; Usener, *Rh. M.* 29 (1874), p. 27; 58 (1903), 163 sq.; Eitrem, *Hermes u. d. Toten*, 1 sq.

⁶ Aristot. *Oec.* I, 6, p. 1345; Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1153; Hermes and Hecate seem also to have been connected in the house cult; cf. Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* 1007, n; 1335 sq.; Eitrem, p. 9; and Hermes, as H. Chthonius, like Hecate, associated with the spirits of the dead; cf. Rohde, *Psy.* I, p. 238; Eitrem, pp. 41 sq.

⁷ Aristoph. *Eq.* 1320; Frazer on Paus. I, 31, 6.

⁸ Tert. de *Idol.* 15; Prel.-Jord. 2, 217.

⁹ Cf. Wissowa, *R. Lex.* 2, 1872 sq.; De Marchi, *Il Culto Priv. d. Roma Ant.* I, pp. 29 sq.

¹⁰ Cf. Ov. *F.* I, 136; Hieronym. in *Esaiam* 6, 57; Marq.-Momm. *Staatsv.* 3, 126, n. 1; Privatl. 240. Similar evidence from the houses at Pompeii, cf. De Marchi, pp. 80 sq.

¹¹ The ancient Hindoos believed that spirits haunted the threshold; cf. Oldenberg, *Rel. d. Veda* 561; so the Germans, Wuttke, *D. Volksab.*, p. 89;

the threshold and the cross-roads, which are also the common haunt of spirits, not only in Greek and Latin lore, but in that of widely scattered peoples.¹ This connection is to be inferred from the Hecate-cult² and that of the Lares, at whose festival, the Compitalia, figures of wool were hung both on the house-doors and the cross-roads;³ on the cross-roads, too, as on the threshold and near the door, were performed all sorts of magic rites.⁴

Many of the practices connected with the house-door seem to point to a cult which was originally no doubt directed to the spirits that were always near by. A Roman bride had to bind the door-posts of her husband's house with wool and smear them with fat or oil.⁵ The woolen figures, which were hung before doors on the Compitalia evidently originated as a substitute for human sacrifice to these spirits "ut vivis parcerent et essent his pilis et simulacris contenti" (Fest. ep., p. 239, 1). So in Greece, at the time of childbirth, wool or olive branches were hung on the doors,⁶ and at the Ephebia, laurel was hung there.⁷ This custom was also usual at Roman weddings and at other times,⁸ and cypress branches were hung before the door when a corpse lay within.⁹ It was both a Greek and Roman custom to lay

in Russia the Domovoi, or "house-spirit", has his seat there; cf. Spectator (London), June 18, 1892; the house fairies, according to Irish belief; Crooke, F-L of No. India, 1, 241; cf. p. 203. So the Hebrew Elohim, Riess, A. J. P. 18, p. 191.

¹ Cf. Oldenberg, op. cit., 267 sq.; Wuttke, op. cit., p. 89; Samter, op. cit., pp. 120 sq.; Pradel, Griech. Gebete, 96.

² Cf. above, and Rohde, Psy. 2, 79, n. 1; Gruppe, G. M., p. 1291, n. 1.

³ Cf. Fest. ep., p. 121, 17; Macr. S. 1, 7, 34; Prel.-Jord. 2, 111; Samter, op. cit., pp. 111 sq.

⁴ Their important place in the cult of Hecate is sufficient proof of this; cf. Theophr. Ch. 16; Hor. S. 2, 3, 281; Tibul. 1, 3, 11 sq.; 1, 5, 56; cf. Eitrem, op. cit., 40. For similar practices among the ancient Hindoos, cf. Gob. Grih. Sut. 2, 1, 4 (SBE 30, p. 42); ib. 2, 4, 2 (SBE, p. 49); Bloomfield, A. Veda, p. 519.

⁵ Pl. 29, 30; 28, 135; 142; Luc. Phar. 2, 355; Serv. Aen. 4, 458; Prel.-Jord. 2, 217; Samter, 80 sq.

⁶ Hesych. s. v. στέφανον ἐκφέρειν.

⁷ Cf. E. M. 531, 54; Samter, pp. 86 sq.

⁸ Cf. Juv. 6, 79 c. Schol.; Luc. Phar. 2, 354; Sen. Thyest. 54; Tert. ad uxor. 2, 6; cf. the use of laurel on tomb-stones, C. I. L. 6, 10328; cf. A. J. P. 31 (1910), 293 sq.

⁹ Serv. Aen. 3, 64; 681; 4, 507; cf. Prel.-Jord. 2, 93; Rohde, Psy. 1, 220, n. 1.

sacrificial gifts upon the threshold or hang them on the doors,¹—evidently as an altar. As an altar, too, Aeneas (Verg. Aen. 6, 636), when he had purified himself with water before entering the Elysian Fields, fastened the Golden Bough on the threshold in front of him. As an altar, too, the threshold served as a place of refuge for the suppliant and distressed;² cf. Valer. Max. 2, 10, 2: *qui postes ianuae tamquam religiosissimam aram sanctumque templum venerati*. And one of the precepts of Pythagoras was that the doors should be kissed fondly by those who enter or depart,³ and Porphyry. de ant. nym. 27 remarks of his followers: *οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ οἱ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις σοφοὶ μὴ λαλεῖν ἀπηγόρευον διερχομένους ἢ πύλας ἢ θύραν*. In Tibull. 1, 2, 84, part of the lover's penance is: "*dare sacratis oscula liminibus*" of Venus' temple; so in 1, 3, 29 sq. Delia is to sit, clad in linen, when paying her vows, before the sacred doors of the temple of Isis; cf. Stat. Theb. 9, 606 of Atalanta at the shrine of Diana: "*limine divae/astitit et . . . precatur*"; cf. ib. 6, 636; Petron. 133, 3. This sacredness is emphasized also by the fact, recorded in a fragment of Menander, Inc. 740 K. that people swore "by the doors":⁴ *μαρτύρομαι, ναὶ μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω τουτονὶ/καὶ τὰς θύρας*.

Several theories⁵ have been advanced to explain the general belief in the sacredness of the threshold, and to account for the

¹ Herod. 1, 90; Verg. Aen. 10, 620; 4, 202; Prop. 4, 3, 17; Tibull. 1, 1, 15; Stat. Theb. 10, 344; Apul. M. 6, 3; for this custom among other peoples, cf. Trumbull, op. cit., pp. 120 sq.

² Cf. Hom. Il. 9, 581 sq.; Ap. Rh. 4, 26; Verg. Aen. 2, 490; 673; 3, 351; 11, 483; Ov. M. 1, 376; 13, 412; Livy 45, 44, 20; Sen. Phaedr. 860; Valer Fl. 1, 676; Juv. 6, 47; Stat. Theb. 3, 688.

³ Mullach, Fr. Ph. Gr. 1, p. 510; cf. Herod. 2, 121 of a similar Egyptian custom; and for parallels elsewhere, Trumbull, op. cit., pp. 12, 31, 116, 123, 130.

⁴ Cited by Riess, A. J. P. 18, 191.

⁵ According to Trumbull, pp. 1, 98, the primitive altar of the family was on the threshold, and "when first a twain were made one in a covenant of blood the threshold altar of the race was hallowed as the place where the author of life met and blessed the loving union". It has also been suggested that "the threshold marks the limit which separates the friendly house-spirits from the vagrant hostile ghosts"; or "that both the threshold and the foundation stone (both possibly originally identical) were analogues of the Ashma stone of India, and of the Churinga of the natives of Australia; in short that they represented the sacred stones in which the ancestral spirit was confined"; Crooks, l. l.

superstitions connected with it, but these fail to give any satisfactory explanation for the presence of spirits in its neighborhood. This can only be accounted for, it seems to me, by the wide-spread custom of burying the dead under the threshold or before the door,¹—a custom which, I think, can be shown to have prevailed among the ancient Greeks and Romans.²

We know, in the first place, that in early Greece bodies were buried inside the dwelling. Ps.-Plato, *Min.* 315 D expressly tells us that this was the ancient custom,³ and at Thoricus, Aegina, and elsewhere⁴ graves have been found in the floor and walls of houses. That the Greeks also buried their dead under the threshold and before the house-door we must conclude from the following evidence: Neoptolemos was buried under the threshold⁵ of the temple at Delphi (*Schol. in Pind. Nem.* 7, 62). In the *Hel.* of Euripides 1165 sq. Theoklymenos addressing the tomb of his father says *ἐπ' ἐξόδοισι γὰρ | ἔθαψα, Πρωτεύ, σ' ἔνεκ' ἐμῆς προσρήσεως*. The custom, too, of placing the shrines of heroes before the house-door would seem to point to a more primitive time when the dead body itself was buried there;⁶ and with these heroa, perhaps, should be classed the "antelii daemones"⁷ spoken of by Tert. *de idol.* 15, cf. *de cor. mil.* 13, as guardians of the doors among the Greeks. It may be noted, too, that altars were commonly erected both before the house and temple

¹ Cf. Lippert, *Relig. d. Eur. Culturv.* 135; 309 sq.; Hittell, *Mankind in Anc. Times* 1, 257 sq.; Preuss, *Die Begräbnisart d. Amer. u. Nordostas.* pp. 30 sq.; Trumbull, p. 25.

² This theory was suggested by Winternitz, l. l., in order to account for the lifting of the bride, the purpose of which was, he concludes, "dem Zauber der sich an die Schwelle heftete, zu entgehen". And after I had gathered the material for this paper, there appeared the article by Eitrem referred to above, in which he adopts this theory not only to explain the superstitions connected with doors, but primarily the character of Hermes as god of the dead. The custom of placing the statues of Hermes before the door, on the boundaries and cross-roads, was due to the fact that "Hermes wird da verehrt, wo man die Toten begraben hat". Cf. my review in *A. J. P.* 31 (1910), pp. 93 sq.

³ Cf. *Plut. Phoc.* 37; *Rohde* 1, 228, n. 3; 2, 340, n. 3.

⁴ Cf. *Frazer, Paus.* v. 2, p. 533; v. 5, 591; *Eitrem*, pp. 4 sq.

⁵ Cf. the custom of burying in and under the city gate; *Paus.* 5, 4, 4, with *Frazer's* note; *Herod.* 1, 187; *Rohde* 1, 160 and notes.

⁶ Cf. *Herod.* 6, 69; *Kaibel*, *epigr.* 84; ref. in *Lobeck, Aglaoph.* 1335 sq.; *Rohde* 1, 197, n. 2.

⁷ Cf. *Pauly-Wiss.* under the words; cf. *Clem. Alex. Protr.* 4.

threshold,¹ and it was on these altars that all blood offerings were made.²

In order to show that similar burial customs were current among the early Romans, we have to rely chiefly upon analogy, for literary evidence is scanty and by no means convincing. The only references for Roman burial within the house are Serv. Aen. 5, 64;³ cf. 6, 152, and Isid. Or. 15, 11, 1; for burial near the house door, a statement by Fulgentius⁴ that children under forty days old⁵ were buried under the eaves of the house on the yard side. We know, however, that in Rome, as in various cities in Greece,⁶ burial was permitted within the city, for graves of the fourth century have been found within the Servian Wall;⁷ and the analogies between Roman customs and beliefs in connection with the house door should have sufficient weight to warrant the conclusion that, at some time in their history, they practiced the same burial customs. If the worship of the Lares developed, as I believe, out of ancestor worship, the placing of their statues before the house door would form a parallel to the Greek custom

¹Cf. Aeschyl. Supp. 494; Eurip. Andr. 1098; Saglio in Darem.-Sagl. Lex. s. v. ara, 1, 348.

²Cf. Ov. Met. 7, 601 (cf. above, p. 259); ib. 10, 224; Saglio, l. l.

³Domi suae sepeliebantur unde orta est consuetudo ut dii penates colerentur in domibus. Cf. De Marchi, op. cit., 1, 38.

⁴P. 560, 13 Merc. (cf. ed. Helm, p. 113, 19); cf. the Lares grundules, Arnob. 1, 28; Wissowa, Relig. d. R., p. 153, n. 6; De Marchi, l. l. The above references, according to Marq.-Momm. Staatsv. 3, 309, n. 1; Fowler, Clas. Rev. 10, 395; 11, 34 sq.; Rohde, Psy. 1, 228, n. 3, are not conclusive; they are accepted by Voigt, R. Alterth., pp. 794-5; De Marchi, l. l.

⁵In Russia still-born children are buried under the threshold, cf. Ralston, Folk Songs of the Russ. People 136 sq. The fact that Verg. A. 6, 427 puts the souls of little children on the threshold of Hades, may point to a primitive custom of actual burial under the threshold of the home; cf. Conington's note on this passage, and King, Cl. Rev. 17, 83 sq. The excavations at Tell Ta'annek in Palestine show that the ancient inhabitants of this region buried young children in the house; cf. Sellin, Denkschr. d. Wien. Akad. phil.-hist. Kl. 50 (1904) IV, pp. 33 sq.; 36. The wide-spread belief in rebirth, and such an idea as that of the Algonquin Indians, who would bury little children by the wayside, "that their souls might enter into mothers passing by, and hence be born again", would furnish the reason for such burial customs; cf. Dieterich, Mutter Erde 21 sq.

⁶Cf. Paus. 5, 4, 4, c. Frazer's note; Bekker, Char.², 3, 105 sq.; Eitrem, pp. 4 sq.

⁷Cf. Jahrb. d. Arch. 22, 1908, p. 443; Mon. Ant. 15, 1905, p. 752; De Marchi, l. l.; Cic. de leg. 2, 58.

in regard to the heroa.¹ The statues of famous men, at all events, were placed there, and the fact that the "hostium spolia" were affixed to them² points to an earlier cult: cf. Pl. N. H. 35, 7: *aliae foris et circa limina animorum ingentium imagines erant adfixis hostium spoliis quae nec emptori refigere liceret, triumphabantque etiam dominis mutatis emptae domus*; cf. Verg. Aen. 7, 177 sq.³

There are, moreover, convincing evidences that the cult which, as the examples quoted above show, was connected with the threshold and the door, can have been concerned, in origin, at least, only with the spirits of the dead. This we must conclude to be the meaning of the binding of the door-posts with wool, which was used frequently in purificatory and other rites connected with the dead,⁴ and the practice of smearing them with fat and oil which were sprinkled, evidently as offerings, upon graves and grave-stones;⁵ so the olive, laurel, and cypress were closely associated with the cult of the dead, and were commonly placed on graves.⁶ This is true of lamps, also, which were so frequently placed before doors.⁷ The *χθόνια λουτρά*, too, the "aqua adferea" or "adferial" of the Romans,—the water,

¹ Cf. above, pp. 262, 265. Compare the explanation of the ancients themselves that the Lares=Manes or *ἡρώες*; Arnob. 3, 41; Dion. Hal. 3, 70; 4, 2, 14; Wissowa, op. cit., p. 153; Prel.-Jord., R. My. 2, 102 sq.

² Or to the door-posts: cf. Tibull. 1, 1, 54; Prop. 3, 9, 26; Hor. Od. 4, 15, 6; Pers. 6, 45; Stat. Theb. 3, 581; so on the doors of Cacus' cave (Verg. A. 8, 196), human heads were hung.

³ The Greek and Roman custom of laying the dead body out near or upon the threshold may have been a survival of primitive burial there; cf. Hom. Il. 19, 212; Schol. Arist. Lys. 611; Ter. Phor. 97; Verg. A. 11, 29; Pers. 3, 105.

⁴ Cf. Alciph. 3, 37; Diels, Sibyl. Blät. 70; Samter, l. l., 37 sq.; Gruppe, Gr. M. 892, n. 1.

⁵ Cf. Plut. Arist. 21; Eurip. Iph. T. 633; Samter 82 sq.; cf. too, the custom of anointing stones and other fetishes with oil; Lang, Cust. and Myth. 52; Usener Rh. M. 50, 147.

⁶ The dead were laid out upon olive branches, Pl. 35, 160; cf. Ael. v. h. 6, 6; Plut. Lyc. 27; cf. their use in purificatory rites, Soph. O. C. 484. For laurel wreaths sculptured on tombs, cf. C. I. L. 6, 10328; in purification, cf. Schol. Eurip. Alc. 98; Pl. 15, 135; cf. Eurip. Ion 102 sq. Cypress grew in the lower world, Petron. 120, 75; in haunted groves, Sen. Thyest. 654; Stat. Theb. 4, 459; on graves, Paus. 8, 14, 4.

⁷ Cf. Tert. de idol. 15; apol. 35; placed on graves, Petron. 111, 4; cf. Diels, l. l., 47 sq.

namely, in which the dead body was washed and which was poured upon the grave as an offering,¹ was also as a spirit-offering, as I believe, poured out before the house-door. This is indicated, it seems to me, by a fragment of Aristophanes, *Her.* 306 K: μήτε ποδάνιπτρον θύραζ' ἐκχεῖτε μήτε λούτριον. Pouring this water before the door was thought to prevent the return of the soul,² but the explanation of this belief can only be that this water was originally an offering to the soul, which, like all spirit-offerings, by satisfying its needs prevented its return.³ These *χθόνια λουτρά* are similar in nature to the *ἀπόνιμμα*,⁴—the blood of a sacrificial victim which was washed off from those who underwent purification, and poured into a trench to the west of a tomb, with the words, *οἷς χρὴ καὶ οἷς θέμις*; a sacrifice to the dead could not be more clearly indicated. Similar, too, is the offering of black ram's blood made by Medea in *Ov. Met.* 7, 243 (cf. above, p. 259, and *Hos. Geta Med.* 322 sq.), an offering which she pours in a trench near the house-door.⁵ The custom, indeed, of burying substances under the threshold must have originated in the idea that they were offerings to the dead, and it was because they were offerings and satisfied the needs of the spirits that they came to be considered prophylactic. Nothing could speak more eloquently for the truth of this statement than the words of *Ov. F.* 2, 573, in his account of Tacita: "et digitis tria tura tribus sub limine ponit/qua brevis occultum mus sibi fecit iter"; mice were daemonic beasts⁶ and "tus" was a common spirit offer-

¹ Cf. *Suid.* s. v.; *Hesych.* s. v.; *Diogen.* 8, 69; *Xenob.* 6, 45; *Lat. Thes.* s. v. *adferial*.

² Cf. *Riess*, A. J. P. 18, 191, to whom I owe the reference. He compares the similar Germ. custom, *Wuttke*, sec. 732; and modern Greek, *Wachsmuth*, d. *alte Gr. im Neuen* 119; 129.

³ An interesting parallel to these practices is furnished by two West Indian customs; cf. *F-L Jour.* 15 (1904), pp. 88, 206: "In Jamaica the water that washed dead body (sic) is thrown upon the grave. Elsewhere, however, when a person dies, the water in which the body is washed must be put on one side, and as the funeral leaves the house, it must be dashed after the hearse, otherwise the *duppy* will haunt the house".

⁴ Cf. *Athen.* 9, 404, E; *Harrison*, *Proleg.* 59 sq.

⁵ For this manner of making a sacrifice to the spirits of the dead, cf. *Stat. Theb.* 4, 442 sq., esp. 454 sq.; and see above, p. 259, n.

⁶ Cf. *Apul. Met.* 2, 22. On the mouse as chthonic, cf. *Gruppe*, *Gr. M.* 803, n. 1 sq.

ing.¹ This idea may not have been the only motive which led to this practice, but it is significant that of the substances which are mentioned in the examples quoted above,² the sheep, the ass, the dog, the sea-onion, the πανσπερμία,—and the cucumber which wrapped in wool was thrown before the door,—all occur as direct offerings to chthonic powers or in close connection with them.³ This relation between the threshold, the spirits of the dead, and the cross-roads where, I believe, the dead were also buried,⁴ may be further illustrated by the words of Plato, Leg. 933 A sq., where he speaks about the prevalence of the belief in magic: ταῖς δὲ ψυχαῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, δυσωπουμένους πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐκ ἄξιον ἐπιχειρεῖν πείθειν, ἃν ποτε ἄρα ἴδωσί που κήρινα μιμήματα πεπλασμένα, εἴτ' ἐπὶ θύραις εἴτ' ἐπὶ τριόδοις εἴτ' ἐπὶ μνήμασι γονέων αὐτῶν τινες.

We may also, I think, if we accept this evidence for burial under the threshold or near the house-door explain the words of Eurip. Alc. 101: χαίτα τ' οὔτις ἐπὶ προθύροις/τομαῖος ἃ δὴ νεκύων/πένθει πίτνει. The shorn hair was heaped up at the door as the primitive place of burial just as it was commonly placed upon the graves of the dead.⁵ Interesting evidence for this is the story told by Herod. 4, 34. In describing the honors paid to the dead Hyperoche and Laodike by the Delians, he says: αἱ

¹ Cf. its use in charms, Verg. Ecl. 8, 66; Ov. M. 9, 154; cf. Heim, Incantamenta, p. 561; its use in funeral rites, Lactant. 1, 20, 26; 4, 18, 12.

² Pp. 254 sq. I omit the draco, but if Pl. means "anguis", for its chthonic character, cf. Gruppe, Gr. M., pp. 807 sq.

³ The sheep offered to spirits of the dead; cf. Lucret. 3, 52; Stat. Th. 4, 443; Luc. Nekyom. 9; to Hecate, Ap. Rh. 3, 1031. The ass was connected with Empusa, Suid. s. v.; with Typhon, Plut. Is. 30; cf. Gruppe, Gr. M. 797 sq.; was sacrificed to Trivia, Ov. F. 1, 391; to the winds, Hesych. s. v. ἀνεμώτας. The dog was sacrificed to Hecate: Theocr. 2, 12, c. Schol.; to the chthonic Mana, Pl. 29, 58, cf. Wissowa, Rel. d. Röm. 196; Deubner, AR. 13 (1910), 503 sq. The sea-onion was used in purification, Diphil. fr. 126 K; Luc. Nek. 7, cf. Rohde, Psy. 2, 406. The πανσπερμία was offered on the Chytroi, cf. Rohde 1, 238 sq. The cucumber occurs in a magic rite in Varro de R. R. 1, 2, 25, where every detail shows that it was used as a spirit-offering.

⁴ This is also Eitrem's opinion, op. cit., p. 11. He cites Kaibel, Epigr. 143, of a young child buried ἐπὶ τριόδῳ. We may note that, according to Plato Leg. 873 B the bodies of those who had committed suicide were cast upon the cross-roads and stones heaped upon them; cf. Jevons, Cl. Rev. 9 (1895), 247 sq. This custom, or that of burial upon the cross roads, may explain the reference to corpses in Petron. 134, 2 and Suet. Vesp. 5.

⁵ Aeschyl. Choeph. 4; Petron. 111, 9; Prop. 1, 17, 21; Sen. Phaedr. 1190; cf. Frazer, Paus. v. 4, p. 136; 2, 534.

<κοῦραι> μὲν πρὸ γάμου πλόκαμον ἀποταμνόμεναι καὶ περὶ ἄτρακτον εἰλί-
ξασαι ἐπὶ τὸ σῆμα τιθεῖσι (τὸ δὲ σῆμά ἐστι ἔσω ἐς τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ἐσιόντι
ἀριστερῆς χειρός, ἐπιπέφυκε δὲ οἱ ἐλαίη). It may be noted, too, that
a threshold sacrifice, evidently founded upon a common folk
practice, is preserved in Mag. Pap. V. III, 27. I may add, also,
that this evidence for threshold sacrifice and for burial beneath
the threshold receives strong confirmation from analogous cus-
toms among other peoples, both Aryan and non-Aryan.¹

Such a conclusion affords a simple explanation for all the folk
beliefs and practices connected with the house-door.² Spirits
haunted the vicinity, as they wandered like shadows about
tombs; (Plat. Phaed. 81 C sq.; Stat. Th. 9, 299; 12, 247 sq.;
Lact. Inst. 2, 2, 6); because of the presence of these spirits of the
dead the threshold, like the cross-roads, was a spot peculiarly
adapted to the performance of magic rites, just as such rites were
often performed on graves (cf. Plat. Leg. 933 A sq.; Pl. N. H.
28, 226); it was bad luck to stumble on the threshold, just as it
brought pollution to walk upon a grave (Plut. Lyc. 27; Sen.
Troad. 492); the threshold as the source of prophetic inspira-
tion is to be compared with the familiar grave-oracles (cf. Rohde,
Psy. 1, 186 sq.), and the fact that the spirits of the dead foretold
the future (Hor. S. 1, 8, 29; Stat. Th. 4, 635; August. de civ.

¹ In ancient India, "bali" offering made on the threshold, cf. Sacr. Bks.
E. 2, 107; 30, 22. In Egypt, a hog, everywhere a chthonic animal, was
annually offered to Osiris before the house-door, cf. Herod. 2, 48. In modern
Greece a pomegranate is broken on the threshold at the time of marriage,
Rodd, Cust. and Lore 95 sq. In Japan salt is sprinkled on the threshold
after a funeral, cf. Griffis, Mikado's Emp. 467; 470; cf. further Trumbull,
op. cit., pp. 122 sq.; 27 sq. With the old Semitic custom of sacrificing a
sheep upon the threshold of the house before a returned traveller could enter
(cf. AR. 13 (1910), p. 80), may be compared the Gr. practice of compelling
such a person to go through a symbolical rebirth, cf. Plut. Q. R. 5; Jevons,
Cl. R. 9 (1895), 247 sq. In Rome he was made to enter the house through
a hole in the roof, Plut. 1. 1.

² Here should be classed, too, the belief that the automatic opening of doors
was a bad omen, although the house-door is not concerned; in Cic. de div. 2,
31, 67 of a shrine of Hercules; in Suet. Jul. 81, cf. Jul. Obs. 127, fores cubiculi;
Suet. Ner. 46 of the Maus. August.; Lamprid. vit. Comm. 16, of the temple
of Janus; cf. Stat. Th. 7, 407 where the omen is "clausae—sponte fores."
Similarly the trembling of doors denoted the presence of a god; cf. Verg. A.
3, 90; 6, 82; Ov. Met. 4, 486; 15, 671; 9, 782; Stat. Silv. 3, 1, 164; Orph.
Arg. 968.

dei 7, 35); offerings were placed upon the threshold or near the house-doors, and wreaths were hung thereon, as upon graves (Eurip. Iph. T. 633; Plut. Sol. 21; Catull. 101; Tibull. 2, 6, 31; 2, 4, 48; Prop. 3, 16, 23); the ground in the vicinity was holy ground, and a refuge for the distressed and suppliant as was the grave itself (Tibull. 2, 6, 33; cf. Rohde, l. l., 1, 230); and finally the teaching of Pythagoras that one should approach doors with due reverence finds its parallel in the statement that one must pass by a hero's shrine in silence (Arist. Av. 1490, c. Schol.; Alciph. 3, 58, 3).

M. B. OGLE.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

II.—LUCILIUS ON *EI* AND *I*.

It is the custom, rightly or wrongly, to consider that when Lucilius gave rules for the use of *ei* and *i* to represent the long *i*, he did not know what he was talking about. Typical comments are the following:

Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 9: "Lucilius prescribed rules for the use of *ei* and ' *i* longa ' ; but instead of keeping *ei* for the original diphthong, and the single letter for the original long vowel, he used foolish distinctions,¹ if we are to believe Velius Longus (56. 7 K.) . . . ". The note referred to after the word *distinctions* reads: "Or should we call them mnemonic, as opposed to scientific, distinctions, meant to impress the orthographic rules on the memory of the common people for whom Lucilius wrote his book? (see Lucil. 26. 1. M.)".

Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, p. 86: "Bisweilen hat Lucilius hier zufällig das etymologisch Richtige getroffen, doch geben die kurzen Stücke, die von seinen Regeln erhalten sind, kein Anrecht darauf, ihm in allen Fällen absolutes Zutrauen entgegenzubringen". Ib., p. 368: "Auch Lucilius schreibt im G. sg. *-i* gegenüber *-ei* im N. pl. vor (IX, 16 ff. M.), doch geht seine Unterscheidung wohl von schulmeisterlichen Spekulationen aus und stimmt nur zufällig mit dem Verhalten des älteren inschriftlichen Materials überein".

However, a closer investigation of the Lucilian passages has led the writer to think that perhaps the rules which he lays down have more basis in reason than is generally conceded to them. To discuss this matter is the purpose of this paper.

In the first place, it has been definitely settled that the confusion in spelling of original *ei* and earlier *i* (either original or due to compensatory lengthening) does not appear until just after 150 B. C. Earlier than this the inscriptions consistently employ *EI* or (occasionally) *E* for original *ei*, and never show *EI* for earlier *i*. But by 150 the sound of the diphthong, after passing through an intermediate stage *ē*, became identical with that of earlier *i*, and confusion in spelling resulted, *EI* and *I*

being used indiscriminately for the sound, of whichever origin it might be.¹

The fragments of Lucilius, in which rules are given for correct orthography in this matter, occur in the ninth book of the *Satires*, written in the period 116–110 B. C., according to Marx. At this time the confusion of the sounds was a long established matter; but that does not prove that Lucilius was unable to make the distinctions. Lucilius was born in the year 180, and had reached his thirtieth year before the two sounds became confused in writing. He had therefore learned the orthography prevalent in the first half of the second century before Christ, in which the confusion did not exist, and when he sets down rules for spelling in this matter, we may expect him to hand over to us the rules which had been taught him in his boyhood and which he had used in his own early manhood. Thus there is every reason *a priori* to believe that his dicta in this matter are based on real knowledge of the practices before the confusion existed.

In dealing with the fragments on this topic, it is to be remembered that the readings of the MSS are not to be depended upon in the least for the use of *ei* and *i*² in the words cited as examples: these examples must be spelled according to the remarks which the author proceeds to make concerning them. Now the text of these lines, according to the edition of Marx, is as follows:

'meille' hominum, duo 'meilia', item huc e utroque opus, 'meiles'	
'meilitiam'. tenues i: 'pilam' in qua lusimus, 'pilum'	
quo <i>piso</i> , tenues. si plura haec feceris pila	360
quae iacimus, addes e 'peila' ut plenius fiat.	
porro hoc si filius Luci	A-
fecerit, <i>i solum</i> , ut 'Corneli Cornificique'.	
iam 'pueri venere' e postremum facito atque i,	-B-
ut pueri plures fiant. i si facis solum,	365
'pupilli, pueri, Lucili', hoc unius fiet.	
mendaci furique addes e, cum dare furei	-C
iusseris	
'hoc illi factum est uni', tenue hoc facies i:	
'haec ille <i>i</i> fecere', addes e, ut pinguius fiat.	370

¹ Sommer, op. cit., p. 86.

² Cf. Anderson, T. A. P. A., XXXVII 73–86, especially 84–86.

In the first passage, 358–361, all editors take *item huc e utroque opus* as referring to the following examples, *meiles meilitiam*; they therefore apply *tenuēs i*, following *meilitiam*, to the following *pilam*, etc. To this there are two objections: the passage contains four examples or sets of examples, and four comments upon the spellings, alternating with each other; it seems at first sight that each example or set of examples needs a comment—then *item huc e utroque opus* refers to the preceding, and each of the other comments refers to what precedes it. The usual interpretation gives two comments to the third set of examples, one or the other of which is superfluous, and gives none to the first set, which needs comment. Secondly, if no comment be given to the first set of examples, it will not be clear¹ how they are to be spelled, since the verses seem intended for *oral* instruction.² I would therefore unhesitatingly place a period after *opus*, and another after *tenuēs i*.

To take up first *item huc e utroque opus*: the text is a manifest improvement over the *huic utroque* of Dousa and most editors, the *heice utroque* of Müller, and the *hisce utroque* of Keil, since it follows exactly the codex. Marx³ supports the reading *huc* by citing Plaut. Rudens 726:

Tu, senex, si istas amas, huc arido argentost opus,

in which *huc* replaces the dative of possession. *Utroque* now offers difficulty, since the meaning is manifestly “both these need e”, and yet it cannot be dative. The dative in *-o* in *uter* and its compounds is a late Latin peculiarity, not found before Apuleius.⁴ As an ablative *utroque* might agree with *e*—“these need both e’s”, but the sense and the manner of expression are not clear. It is more likely that as *huc*, adverb of direction whither, replaces the dative, *utroque*, likewise the adverb of direction whither, has replaced the dative also, and that *huc utroque* is a colloquial equivalent of *his verbis utrique*; the meaning is therefore “these words both need e”. This interpretation, moreover, confirms the correctness of the reading *huc*. Marx⁵ apparently takes this view of *utroque*, though he refers it to what follows instead of to what precedes, saying: *utroque* ad duo vocabula quae secuntur pertinet adver-

¹ Cf. preceding footnote.

² Cf. p. 278.

³ II 134.

⁴ Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre d. lat. Spr. II³, pp. 541 ff.

⁵ II 134.

bium; but the brevity of his expression leaves uncertain his exact interpretation of the manner in which it denotes them.

Marx¹ considers that the monosyllable *e* suffers elision; but this is not to be admitted. It is well known that the interjection *O* does not suffer elision, though if metrically unaccented it is sometimes shortened before an initial vowel. Marx's index² cites *e* in this line and in 370, *pro* 1266, *nam* 215, *ne* 266, *si* 313, *cum* 456, *te* 1304, *dem* 577, as monosyllables suffering elision; but of *pro*, *nam*, *ne*, *si*, *cum*, *te*, *dem* there is a consonantal remnant after the elision. In 370 the reading of Marx is *addes e, ut*; but Schmidt's *adde e, ut* avoids the necessity of total elision. In the present passage total elision of *e* is even less permissible: forms of *uter* in Lucilius invariably have the initial syllable short, as we can see from Marx's own index³ (vv. 419, 584, 781, 1011, 1119); and with total elision of *e*, the meter would require this initial syllable to be long. Now the names of letters form long syllables, as we see in vv. 361, 363, 364, 365, 367; I therefore scan *hūc ē ūtrōque*, with shortening of the (metrically unaccented) long vowel before an initial vowel, a frequent phenomenon in the earlier poets.

Turning now to the words whose orthography Lucilius is discussing, I adopt Dousa's *meillia* for *meilia*, since the Monumentum Ancyranum authorizes *ll* in the plural of this word as well as in the singular. Though early inscriptions do not write doubled letters, the consonants, if pronounced double, appear doubled in writing from 189 B. C. onward, and this spelling became the established method by the time of the Gracchi,⁴ which is before the composition of this passage. Lucilius would undoubtedly conform to this norm, as the doubling was in accord with the pronunciation, and the single writing was not and never had been.

In applying the comment *item huc e utroque opus* to the examples *meille* and *meillia*, only one point remains to be considered—the meaning of *item*. *Item* usually means *in the same manner as* something that has gone before, thus correlating two things or sets of things. But here, if this comment refers to *meille* and *meillia*, it must refer either to some example immediately preceding the citation, which is most unlikely; or mean *aeque*, that is, “both need *e*, *meille* and *meillia* alike”. While

¹ II 134.

² I 155.

³ I 163, *elisio monosyllabi*.

⁴ Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 8.

this is not a violent shift of meaning, still no example of such use can be found by me, and I therefore propose this punctuation:

'meille' hominum, duo 'meillia' item: huc e utroque opus.

Item now has its usual meaning, 'in the same way as the preceding', and emphasizes the fact that both singular *meille* and plural *meillia* have *ei*, unlike singular *pueri* (genitive) with *i* and plural *puerei* (nominative) with *ei*, as we see in 364-366. It is no objection to this punctuation that there is now no caesura, but a break at the end of the third foot; Lucilius furnishes abundant examples of this:

- 34 quare diuinas quicquam? *an tu* qua<ere> re debes
 82 non dico: 'uincat' licet, et uagus exulet, erret
 173 cumque hic tam formosus homo ac te dignus puellus
 203 nam si, quod satis est homini, id satis esse potisset
 293 tristis, difficiles sumus, fastidimus bonorum

and 109, 111, 171, 179, 189, 260, 271, all with similar metrical defects, though of slightly varying natures. Yet these 12 lines all occur within the first 300 verses of Lucilius (edition of Marx).

Lucilius testifies therefore to *meille*, *meillia*. Unfortunately this is one of the uncertain words, not occurring in inscriptions early enough to show its etymology, so far as the vowel of the initial syllable is concerned. Its earliest occurrence is on the milestone of Popilius, C. I. L. I 551, where *MEILIA* and *MILIARIOS* both occur; as the date of the inscription is 132 B. C., we hereby get no information. But as Sommer's derivation¹ of *mille* from **smi* ḡ*hst*h, though accepted by Walde,² has been by Brugmann³ relegated to a place among the improbabilities, it is at least possible that Lucilius may be right in spelling *meille* and *meillia* with the diphthong.

The next portion of the text, taking *tenuēs i* to refer to the preceding and not to the following, is:

'meiles'

'militiam', *tenuēs i*.

Scaliger changed the *mille militiam* of the codex to this form as cited, understanding *item*, etc., to refer to these two words. While he was unquestionably right in identifying the words, his

¹ I. F. X 216-220, XI 323-324.

² Lat. etym. Wörterb. s. v., even in the second edition.

³ I. F. XXI 10-13.

faulty interpretation of the comment caused him to insert an unwarranted *e* in each one. We must read:

‘ miles ’

‘ militiam ’, *tenuēs i*.

This *i*, not *ei*, in these words is confirmed by the inscriptions. *TRIBVNOS MILITARE* occurs in C. I. L. I 63, presumably older than the second Punic war, and *TRIB MIL* is found in C. I. L. I 35, probably of the period 160 to 155 B. C. Both of these are early enough to show distinction between the simple long vowel and the diphthong, and agree in their evidence. Lucilius is therefore right in assigning the simple long vowel to *miles*¹ and to *militiam*.

Lucilius' discrimination between *meille* and *miles* in the matter of spelling is the more interesting because the antiquarian Varro, some 65 years later than Lucilius, considered *miles* to be a derivative of *meille*: L. L. V 89 milites, quod trium milium primo legio fiebat ac singulae tribus Titiensium, Ramnium, Lucerum milia militum mittebant. While avoiding this error, Lucilius has also avoided any voicing of the silly notion of his friend Aelius Stilo, cited by Paul. Fest., p. 122 M.: Militem Aelius a mollitia κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν dictum putat, eo, quod nihil molle, sed potius asperum quid gerat; sic ludum dicimus, in quo minime luditur.

Marx's reading for 359 makes *-es i pi-* a dactyl; but comparison with 361, 363, 364, 365, 367 shows that *i* and *e* as names of letters are long syllables. This in itself proves that the syllables are to be reduced by one; but if further proof be needed, we have only to recall that Lucilius is discussing the spelling of *i*, not of *i*, and that *pi-* must be *pī-*. The codices here have *tenuēs i*, which is kept by most editors, though Müller has *tenuest i*. I propose *tenuē i*, similar to *i solum* in 363; their equivalence in meaning is shown by the phrases *tenuē hoc facies i* 369 and *i si facis solum* 365. *Tenuē i* would easily become corrupted to *tenuē si* from the *si* of the next line, whence came *tenuēs i* of the codices. It is to be emphasized that *tenuēs i*, in which *tenuēs* is the present subjunctive of *tenuāre*,² has the

¹ Kent, T. A. P. A. XLI 1-5.

² *Tenuēs* cannot be the plural feminine adjective, for names of letters are neuter in Lucilius, as we see in 363, 365, and in

351 A primum est, hinc incipiam.

379 S nostrum et semigraecei quod dicimus sigma

metrical value $\cup \cup - -$, though it stands for $\cup \cup -$; and that the verb *tenues* alone (the only alternative to *tenue i*) would be remarkable, since all other comments mention the letter *e* or *i*—except that in 360, which likewise is suspicious from the lack of the name of the letter. Marx¹ relies upon the use of *attenuatio* in Auct. ad Herenn. IV 21, 29, to justify the use of the verb *tenuare*. The passage is: *adnominatio . . . multis et variis rationibus conficitur. attenuatione aut complexione eiusdem litterae sic . . .* The examples that follow show that *attenuatio* is the 'exclusion', *complexio* the 'inclusion' of the letter in question. The object of the verb *tenuare* would then of necessity be the name of the letter, not the word containing the letter. Now *tenuare* in this sense would be a strictly technical word, and without its object expressed would be distinctly difficult to understand. But Lucilius himself tells us:²

595 nec doctissimis <nec scribo indoctis nimis>. Man<il>ium
596 Persium<ue> haec legere nolo, Iunium Congum uolo,

in which the additions are by Marx, following the evidence of Crassus ap. Cic. de Or. II 6, 25: *nam ut C. Lucilius, homo et doctus et perurbanus, dicere solebat neque se ab indoctissimis neque a doctissimis legi uelle, quod alteri nihil intellegerent, alteri plus fortasse quam ipse*, de quo etiam scripsit "Persium non curo legere". It is quite in accord with this that we find that all these precepts on *i* and *ei* are couched in the simplest language, containing not a single technical term, and at times even of a half jocular nature, as in *cum dare furei iusseris*.³ In fact, they seem to be mere mnemonic devices, as Lindsay⁴ suggests, and may be paralleled by the English jingles on the defective declension of *nemo*:

Of *nemo* never let me see
Neminis and *nemine*,

and on the spelling of *ei* and *ie*:

I before *e*,
Except after *c*,
And when sounded as *a*,
As in *neighbor* and *weigh*.

¹ II 134.

² V. p. 282.

³ Apud Plin. N. H. praef. 7.

⁴ V. p. 272.

Therefore *tenues*, a severely technical term, would be out of harmony with the purpose of these rules. But *tenue i*, 'a slender *i*', as opposed to a 'fat' diphthong, is a term readily intelligible to all. The correct reading in 359 is accordingly *tenue i*.

The case of *militiam* is noteworthy. Marx¹ on *pilam* says: Accusativum non tolles cum antea legatur "meilitiam", postea "*pilum quo piso tenues*". But *militiam* is here in the accusative merely *metri gratia*; as for *pilam*, its position between *militiam* and *pilum* (which may be either nominative or accusative) causes its assimilation in ending to the other two. As we have seen, *tenues* here and in the following line is hardly a verb governing these examples as objects; against this are the considerations just mentioned, and the case of *miles*, which is coordinate with *militiam*.

The next set of examples, with the comment, is:

'pilam' in qua lusimus, 'pilum'
quo piso, tenues.

Marx² defends the *in* by citing

641 cum <*in*> stadio, in gymnasio, in duplici corpus siccassem pila

and adds: Itaque *i* brevis semper secundum Lucilium *i* sola scribenda est. There is however an essential difference: *duplex pila* is the name of a specific game, while *pila* alone is not. Besides this, we have already seen that the length of the name of the letters forbids his text here, certainly preventing us from considering *pilam* as a possibility. Moreover, Lucilius is not (pace Marx) dealing here with *i*, but with *z*. If then the word be *pilam*, it is either the word *pila* 'pillar' or the word *pila* 'mortar'. Which it is, is clearly shown by Velius Longus GL. VII 56 K.: idemque *peila* quibus milites utuntur per *e* et *i* scribenda existimat, at *pila* in qua pinsetur per *i* (*sic cod.*).³ *Pilam* therefore is the word meaning 'mortar'. *In qua* is accordingly entirely in place; but the *lusimus* is manifestly wrong. The perfect tense strikes our attention at once: Dousa took such offense that he emended it to the present *ludimus*; all editors followed

¹ II 134.

² II 134.

³ This is the passage that misled Müller into emending *pilum quo* to *pilam qua*.

him until Marx, who conservatively returned to the reading of the codex. By the principle of the lectus difficilior *lusimus* can hardly come from *ludimus*. But if *pilam* mean 'mortar', *pinsimus* is the word that must have stood here, and this reading is hinted at by the citation from Velius Longus. The corruption is easily followed. The three strokes of *in* became reduced to two, and these, being between consonants, were read as the vowel *u*; then the influence of *pilam*, understood as *pilam*, caused the scribe to change the unintelligible *pusimus* to *lusimus*. Like *pinsimus*, thus proved to have contained the *n*, *pinso* must be written in the next verse, and not *piso*.¹

As for the verb *tenues* 360, the failure to mention the letter under discussion is suspicious, as we have already seen. In order to overcome this difficulty, Dousa changed to *tenues i*, omitting *si* in the next sentence, where it was needed. Therefore, though the subjunctive *tenues* is perfectly intelligible, = *tenue facias*, still the omission of the name of the letter as object and the technical nature of the expression cause me to propose *tenue i*, as in 359. Since this was followed by *si plura*, it might easily, through dittography of the *s*, become *tenues* (or *tenuis* or *tenueis*, either easily changed to *tenues* by a scribe who understood them as being nom.-acc. plurals of *i*-stems). Our text then is:

'pilam' in qua pinsimus, 'pilum'
quo pinso, tenue i.

Pila 'mortar' is from an earlier **pins-lā*, and *pilum* 'pestle' is from earlier **pins-lom*; both are derivatives to *pi(n)so* 'I pound', and have original *ī* lengthened by compensation upon the loss of the *s* before the *l*. Lucilius is therefore perfectly justified in requiring a mere *i*, *tenue i*, in both these words.

The next section is:

si plura haec feceris pila
quae iacimus, addes e 'peila' ut plenius fiat.

I would here make no change in the text, except that of *pila* to *peila*. The question of the meaning comes up: Does Lucilius mean that *peila* 'spears' has an *e* to distinguish it from the

¹ Therefore *piso* of Marx and *pisunt* of Müller and Keil in the next verse are faulty spellings.

singular of the same word, or does he mean that this distinguishes it from forms of *pila* 'mortar' and *pilum* 'pestle'? If the former, Lucilius is wrong in making such a distinction. Now the passage from Velius Longus, already cited, paraphrases this passage, but takes no account of the question of the number of *peila*; and the Lucilian passage itself states that the purpose of the *e* is "that *peila* may become 'fuller'". Had a discrimination between singular and plural of the word been the point at issue, he would surely have stated the spelling of the singular, and have ended the verse 361 with a (metrical) equivalent of *ut peila plura fiant*; cf. 365 *ut puerei plures fiant*.

Peila 'spears' has therefore, according to Lucilius, the diphthong. The accepted etymology¹ is **pigslom*, to the root *pig-* or *pik-* seen in *pignus* 'fist', etc. An alternative, admitted by Walde as a possibility, is Niedermann's connection² of the word with Lith. *peilis* 'knife', to the root *pei-* without the determinative *k* or *g*. *Pilum* would then be from **pei-lom*, and would have a right to the *e* given it by Lucilius, since it contained the diphthong originally.

The next passage, 362-363, reads:

porro hoc si filius Luci
fecerit, *i solum*, ut 'Corneli Cornificique'.

Lucilius is here discussing the form of the genitive singular of nouns having *-ius* in the nominative, and prescribes the *i* as against the *ei*. Special attention must be called to the fact that he is NOT trying to distinguish *-i* and *-ei*, since *-ei* in such genitives appears for the first time in Catullus;³ yet all editors, following the Roman grammarians,⁴ consider that such is his intent. *i solum*, however, does not necessarily mean one *i* as opposed to two; in 365 *i solum* is used of *i* in *pupilli* and in

¹ Walde, Lat. et. Wörterb., s. v. In the second edition he suggests **peigslom*, "falls des Lucilius . . . *peila* auf echter Tradition fusst"; but this would give **pillum*!

² I. F. XV 113.

³ Cf. Merrill, Univ. of Calif. Public. in Class. Philol., II, pp. 57-79; though Merrill takes issue with Bentley's dictum on this point, still the genitive in *-ei* is not proved with certainty before Catullus.

⁴ Charis. I 78, 5 ad 79, 1; Cassiod. VII 206, 21-27; Bede VII 251, 6-20; also Marx II 409-410, ad versus 1294-5.

pueri, where there can be no question of *-ii*. Now we know from early inscriptions that the ending of the genitive singular of *o*-stems is *-ī*, not the diphthong,¹ and thus the contraction to a single *i* in *io*-stems took place early. Lucilius is therefore right in pronouncing the genitive singular of nouns in *-ius* to end in *-ī*, and not in the diphthong.

Verses 364–366 need not be repeated here, since the text is good. Lucilius says that the genitive singular of *o*-stems ends in *-ī* and that the nominative plural ends in *-ei*. That his statement is perfectly correct is shown by the testimony of the older inscriptions.²

The next passage, 367–368, reads :

mendaci furique addes e, cum dare furei
iusseris.

I would read, at the beginning, *mendacei fureique* (as did Dousa), for evident reasons. It seems a little forced to say “when you bid (someone) make a present to a thief”, for of course no one is going to do such a thing. Therefore Lachmann gives in his text *cum ‘dato, Furei’, iusseris*,³ “when you direct ‘You shall give, Furius’”, a particularly pointless remark, leaving *mendaci furique* without any connection with the rest of the passage; more than that, the vocative of *Furius* would have *-ī*, not *-ei*, though a statement on this point does not appear in the extant fragments of Lucilius. Müller’s *cum ‘dabis, Furi’, iusseris* has precisely the same defect, though he attaches the fragment directly to 363, and makes *mendaci* and *furi* further examples of genitives of *io*-stems, like *Corneli* and *Cornifici*. The manner in which the citation is given by Quintilian manifestly forbids this. Curiously, the obvious fact that Lucilius was using *dare* merely as a non-technical means of indicating that the forms are in the dative case escaped them, but has since been seen and commented upon by Marx.⁴

Lucilius therefore prescribes *-ei* in the dative singular of consonant stems. That this is correct, is well known.⁵

¹ Sommer, *op. cit.*, p. 369.

² Sommer, *op. cit.*, p. 368, pp. 377–378.

³ Cf. R. Bouterwek, *Quaestiones Lucilianae*, p. 14, Elberfeld, 1857.

⁴ II 137; so also earlier editors. Cf. also Skutsch, *Glotta* I 310 ftn.

⁵ Sommer, *op. cit.*, p. 408.

The last passage, 369–370, reads :

‘hoc illi factum est uni’, tenue hoc facies i :
 ‘haec illi fecere’, addes e, ut pinguius fiat.

The only change I would suggest is the adoption of Schmidt’s *adde* to avoid the total elision of *e*, a matter that has already been discussed. *e* is here before a caesura and bears the metrical stress; it therefore keeps its length, though before a vowel. This change involves, of course, no change in meaning. Lucilius states that the dative singular in such words as *illi* and *uni* ends in *-i*, and the nominative plural masculine of the same words ends in *-ei*. The latter statement is correct; the former is of course incorrect.¹ This is the first definite error in which Lucilius is detected, for *meille*, *meillia*, *peilum* ‘spear’ are at least possibly right, and all his other examples are surely right. How did he come to err in *illi* and *uni*, dative singular? The reason is, I think, not hard to find, and has already been stated in brief by Marx.² The pronouns and pronominal adjectives with genitive in *-ius* and dative in *-i* are for the rest declined precisely like *o-* *ā*-stems, with the exception of the masculine nominative singular and the nominative and accusative neuter singular of a few of them. Lucilius therefore associated them with the adjectives of this declension. Finding that the genitive of masculine and neuter nouns with *-us -um -ius -ium* in the nominative, and the vocative singular of masculine nouns with *-ius* in the nominative ended in *-i*, and that on the other hand the nominative and vocative plural of such masculine nouns had *-ei* (or *-iei*) and the dative and ablative plural of the same, whether masculine or neuter, ended in *-eis* (or *-ieis*), he drew the conclusion that in this declension, where there was an *i*-sound, the spelling *i* belonged to the singular and the spelling *ei* belonged to the plural. Thereby he was led into his error in the matter of *illi* and *uni* and other similar datives. Special attention should be paid to the fact that this error did not cause him to go astray in the spelling of the dative singular of consonant stems: possibly the *-is* (not *-eis*) accusative ending in the plural of *i*-stems, whence it was often extended to consonant stems, prevented such an error.

¹ Sommer, op. cit., p. 473.

² II 137.

The results of the investigation are :

I. The following, according to Lucilius, should be written with *ei* :

meille, meillia: this cannot be shown to be wrong.

peilum 'spear': this cannot be shown to be wrong.

ending of nom. voc. pl. of *o*-stems, masc. (and fem.): correct.

Example: *puerei*.

ending of dat. sing. of consonant stems: correct. Examples: *mendacei, furei*.

ending of nom. voc. plur. of certain pronouns and pronominal adjectives: correct. Example: *illei*.

II. The following, according to Lucilius, should be written with *i* :

miles, militia: correct.

pila 'mortar', *pilum* 'pestle': correct.

ending of gen. sing. of *io*-stems: correct. Examples: *Luci, Corneli, Cornifici, Lucili*.

ending of gen. sing. of *o*-stems: correct. Examples: *pupilli, pueri*.

ending of dat. sing. of certain pronouns and pronominal adjectives: wrong, but reason for error plain. Examples: *illi, uni*.

Our conclusion is that Lucilius is within narrow limits accurate in his rules for the writing of *i* and *ei*, but that he did not understand the linguistic basis for the difference, and therefore fell into one error in the ten rules which he gives us.

Three points may now be treated briefly. In Marius Victorinus GL. VI 18 we find the statement that earlier grammarians prescribed *ei* in *sīca* and in the military *vīnea*, but *i* in *fistula* and in the *vīnea* of viticulture. As there is nothing to connect this statement with Lucilius, I have refrained from comment upon it.

The fragment given by Marx as

1294 — — — seruandi numeri et uersus faciendi

1295 nos Caeli Numeri numerum ut seruemus modumque,

from Charisius GL. I 78, after Dousa, who fills in the first verse with *quare*, appears in Keil, Müller and Lachmann as

seruandi Numeri numerum ut seruemus modumque.

Marx¹ shows however, in his comment on the verses, that they

¹ II 409-410.

are not grammatical rules, but of an entirely different nature, though wrongly understood by Charisius. They therefore do not come within the scope of the present article.

The relative order of the five fragments contained in 358–370 is one upon which there is little evidence. In Quint. I 7 15 the *pueri* passage (364–366) is stated to precede the *mendaci* passage (367–368). In Charis. I 78–79 the *filius Luci* passage (362–363) is stated to precede the *pueri* passage (364–366). In Vel. Long. VII 56 the *pueri* passage (364–366), the *illi* passage (369–370) and a paraphrase of part of the *mille* passage (358–361) are cited in that order, though without a direct or even an indirect implication that this is their relative order in the original. We may infer that the pronouns were treated after the nouns, and place the *illi* passage after the *mendaci* passage. Then the position of 358–361 remains uncertain; but on the slight indication given by Vel. Long. and by the allusion in *item*,¹ I am inclined to place it at the end, instead of at the beginning. The result is precisely the order of Lachmann. Yet as the edition of Marx certainly will be the definitive edition of Lucilius for many years to come, I have not felt justified in changing the order in the text of the fragments which is given later. The following table shows the relative orders given the fragments by the different editors; each passage is cited by the first example in the classical spelling of the word:

Dousa	}	pueri	illi	mille	mendaci	Luci
Ed. Bipontina						
Perreau						
Schmidt	}	Luci	pueri	illi	mendaci	mille
Gerlach		pueri	illi	mendaci	mille	
Elsperger						
Lachmann		Luci	pueri	mendaci	illi	mille
Müller	}	pueri	illi	Luci	mendaci	mille
Merrill						
Marx		mille	Luci	pueri	mendaci	illi

In view of the numerous changes that have in the course of this paper been made in the text and in its interpretation, there now follows the text with translation and critical apparatus, and then the sources for the passages, with other testimonia veterum, are cited in full.

¹ V. p. 276.

I. TEXT, TRANSLATION AND APPARATUS CRITICUS.

The following editions of these fragments of Lucilius have been carefully compared, and their readings appear in the apparatus, as well as the readings of the manuscripts. Of these editions, Elserger follows precisely the text of Gerlach; Perreau agrees with the Bipontine edition except in having *Lucilli* 366 and *quum* 367; Merrill follows Mueller except in having *puerei* 365, *illei* 370. Except for 362-363, Dousa (p. 113) admits his debt to Scaliger, and his readings are usually cited under Scaliger's name; but I have here consistently cited them under Dousa's own name. Further, no account has been taken of the apostrophe as a typographical substitute for a final *s* not helping to make position.

Dousa. F. Dousa, *C. Lucili Satyrarum Reliquiae*, 1597, Plantin, Lugd. Bat.

Bipontina. A. Persii Flacci et Dec. Jun. Juvenalis Satirae ad optimas editiones collatae; accedit Sulpiciae satira; C. Lucilii satirographorum principis fragmenta (Societas Bipontina), 1785; Biponti ex typographia Societatis.

Perreau. A. Perreau, *Juvenalis et Persius; item Lucilii fragmenta*; vol. III, 1830, Lemaire, Paris.

Schmidt. L. F. Schmidt, *C. Lucilii Satirarum quae de libro nono supersunt disposita et illustrata*, in *Programm des Friedrichs-Werderschen Gymnasiums*, 1840, Nauck, Berlin.

Gerlach. F. D. Gerlach, *C. Lucilii Saturarum Reliquiae*, 1846, Meyer et Zeller, Turici.

Elserger. C. Elserger, *Commentatio de satira Lucilii*, in *Sollennia Anniversaria in Gymnasio Regio Onoldino*, 1851, Bruegel.

Mueller. L. Mueller, *C. Lucili Saturarum Reliquiae*, 1872, Teubner, Leipzig.

Lachmann. C. Lachmann, *C. Lucilii Saturarum*, 1876, Reimer, Berlin (Lachmann died 1851, but this was not printed until this date).

Merrill. E. T. Merrill, *Fragments of Roman Satire*, 1897, American Book Company, New York.

Marx. F. Marx, *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*, 2 vols., 1904-5, Teubner, Leipzig.

Keil. H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, Teubner, Leipzig: vol. I, 1857; vol. VI, 1874; vol. VII, 1880.

- 358 'meille' hominum, duo 'meillia' item: huc e utroque opus.
 'miles',
 359 'militiam': tenue i. 'pilam' in qua pinsimus, 'pilum'
 360 quo pinso: tenue i. si plura haec feceris 'peila'
 361 quae iacimus, addes e, 'peila' ut plenius fiat.

Meille, a 'thousand', of men, two *meillia*, 'thousands', likewise: these words both need *e*. *Miles*, 'soldier', and *militia*, 'military service'—plain *i*. *Pila*, 'mortar', in which we pound, *pilum*, 'pestle', with which I pound—plain *i*. But if you mention several of these *peila*, 'spears', that we throw, add *e*, that *peila* may become "fuller".

358-361: apud Terentium Scaurum GL. VII 19, 1-4; cf. Marium Victorinum GL. VI 17, 21 ad 18, 10, Velium Longum GL. VII 56, 13-14.

Codices Terentii: *B* Bernensis 330.

P Palatinus 174.

Editio Terentii: ω Basileensis, anno 1527.

358 mille *BP* ω : *meile* Dousa, *Bip.*, *Schm.*, *Gerl.*, *Muell.*; *meille* *Lachm.*, *Marx*; mille *Keil*.

duo milia *P* ω , $\cdot\overline{\text{II}}\cdot$ *B*; duo *meilia* *edd. plurimi*; duo *meillia* *Dousa*, *Bip.*, *Lachm.*

item: *omnes edd. priores ante item diviserunt*; *Kent post*.

huc *BP* ω ; huic *Dousa et edd. plur.*; heice *Muell.* (cf. *Afran. Except. fr. III ap. Frag. Rom. Com. ed.³ Ribb.*); hisce *Keil*; huc e *Marx*.

mille *BP* ω ; *meiles* *Dousa et edd. plur.*; *miles* *Kent*.

359 *militiam* *B* ω , *miliciam* *P*; *meilitiam* *Dousa et edd. plur.*; *militiam* *Kent*. *Post militiam punctum posuerunt omnes edd. priores*; *Kent ante pilam posuit*.

tenues i *BP*, *tenuē* si ω ; *tenues* i *Dousa et edd. plur.*; *tenuest* i *Muell.*; *tenuē* i *Kent*.

pilam in qua *lusimus* *BP* ω ; *pīlam* qua *ludimus* *Dousa et edd. plur.*; *pīlai* qua *ludimus* *Muell.*; *pīlam* in qua *lusimus* *Marx*; *pīlam* in qua *pinsimus* *Kent*.

359-360 *pilum* quo ipso *P* ω , *pilum* quo ipse *B*.

pilum quo *Dousa et edd. plur.*; *pīlam* qua *Muell. ex Velio*.

pinso *Dousa et edd. plur.*; *pisunt* *Muell.* (*quod t sequitur*), *Keil*; *pisō* *Marx*.

360 *tenues* si plura haec feceris *pila* *BP* ω .

367 'mendacei' 'furei'que addes e, cum dare 'furei'
368 iusseris.

369 "hoc 'illi' factum est 'uni'": tenue hoc facies i.

370 "haec 'illei' fecere": adde e, ut pinguius fiat.

To *mendacei*, 'to a liar', and to *furei*, 'to a thief', add an *e*, when you bid something be given *furei*, 'to a thief'.

"So-and-so was done *illi uni*, 'with that one fellow'": make this *i* plain. "*Illei*, 'those fellows', have done so-and-so": add *e*, that the word may become "fatter".

et *cod. Velii*; e, ut, et *codd. Quint.*; e *edd. omnes*.

365 ut plures faciant *cod. Velii et R*; ut pueri plures fiant *codd. Quint.*; ut plures puerei fiant *Dousa, Bip.*; ut pueri plures fiant *Muell.*; ut puerei plures fiant *edd. ceteri, incluso Merrillio*.

366 . . . pueri Lucii hoc unius fieri *cod. Charis*.

pupilli pueri et Lucilli hoc unius fiet *cod. Velii*.

pupilli pueri huc unius fiet *R*.

pupilli pueri Luceili hoc unius fiet *Dousa, Bip., Gerl., Schmidt*.

pupilli pueri Lucilli hoc unius fiet *Perreau*.

pupilli pueri Lucili hoc unius fiet *Lachm., Muell., Keil, Marx*.

367-368: Apud Quintilianum I 7, 15; cf. Aulum Gellium XIII 25, 4.

mendaci furique codd. et edd plur.; *mendacei fureique Dousa, Bip., Gerl.* Post *furique punctum posuit Lachm.*; *idem Muell., qui haec nomina ut genetivos singularis numeri versu 363 iunctos intellegit; ceteri punctum non posuerunt.*

quum Dousa, Perreau, Schmidt; *cum ceteri edd.*

dari furei cod. Lassbergianus vel Friburgensis. dare furi cod. Turicensis, dare fueri cod. Ambrosianus; dabis Furi Muell.; dato Furei Lach.; dare furei Dousa et ceteri edd. (Lucil. et Quint.).

369-370: Apud Velium Longum GL. VII 56, 11-12.

R editio princeps Velii, Romae, 1587.

369 *factum est cod. et edd. plur.*; *factumst Muell.*

hoc (post tenue) cod. et edd. plur.; *heic vel huic Muell.; heic Merrill.*

370 haec ille facere addes e ut pinguius facit *cod.*; faciat *R.*
 ille facere facit "*utrumque dudum emendatum*"—*Marx.*
 illei *Dousa et edd. plur., incluso Merrillio*; illi *Muell.*
 addes e *Dousa, Bip., Marx*; adde e *edd. ceteri.*

IV. TESTIMONIA VETERUM.

A. Quintilianus I 7, 15; text of Bonnell, 1854.

diutius duravit, ut E I iungendis eadem ratione qua Graeci
 « uterentur; ea casibus numerisque discreta est, ut Lucilius
 praecepit

iam pueri . . . plures fiant (364–365).

ac deinceps idem:

mendaci . . . iusseris (367–368).

B. Aulus Gellius XIII 25, 4; text of Hosius, 1903.

id quoque in eodem (XXIV) libro Nigidiano animadvertimus:
 si 'huius' inquit 'amici' vel 'huius magni' scribas, unum i facito
 extremum; sin vero 'hii magnii', 'hii amicii'¹ casu multitudinis
 recto, tum <i> ante i scribendum erit², atque id ipsum facies in
 similibus. item, si 'huius terrai' scribas, i littera sit³ extrema,
 si 'huic terrae', per e scribendum est. item, 'mi'⁴ qui scribit in
 casu interrogandi, velut cum dicimus 'mi' studiosus', per unum
 i scribat, non per e; at cum 'mei'⁵, tum per e et i scribendum
 est, quia dandi casus est.

Potius legendum cum edd. vetustioribus:

1 'hei magnei', 'hei amicei' 2 tum ante i scribendum
 erit e 3 fit 4 'mei' 5 'mehei'

Adnot. crit. ex editione Hosii.:

mi: mi *edd. vett.*, mei ω.

mei: mei γ, miei δ.

ω consensus codicum (A)PRV aut omnium aut reliquorum.

δ archetypus codicum (B)QZ.

γ archetypus codicum NOTX.

C. Charisius GL. I 78, 5 ad 79, 1.

*Lucius et Aemilius et cetera*¹ nomina quae ante u habent i
 duplici i genetivo *singulari* finiri² debent, *ne*³ necesse sit adversus
*observationem nominum*⁴ nominativo minorem fieri genetivum;
 idque Varro tradens adicit⁵ *vocativum quoque* singularem⁶ talium
 nominum per duplex i⁷ scribi debere, *sed propter differentiam*
casuum corrumpi.⁸ *Lucilius tamen et per unum i* genetivum⁹

scribi posse existimat: ait enim "servandi Numeri numerum ut¹⁰ servemus *modumque*". numquam enim hoc intulisset, nisi et Numerium per i, huius *Numeri*¹¹ faciendum crederet. denique et in libro *VIII*¹² sic ait

porro . . . Cornificique¹³ (362-363).

et paulo post

pueri . . . fieri (365-366).

Ita restituit locum Keilius, codicis Neapolitani scriptura ex parte deleta; ex codice Coloniensi iam deperdito, cui tamen Marx II 135 fidem tribuit, F. Dousa apud Lucilii reliq. lib. IX fr. 7 habet has lectiones aut supplementa:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1 Lucius Aemilius et caetera | 9 per unum i in genitivo |
| 2 ii genetivos singulares finire | 10 numeri et versus faciendi nos |
| 3 ut; non <i>ante</i> minorem <i>inse-</i> | Caeli Numeri numerum ut |
| <i>ruit Dousa.</i> | 11 nisi et Caelii et Numerii per |
| 4 nominum <i>omisit Dousa</i> | ii huius Numerii |
| 5 adiecit | 12 in libro quarto |
| 6 vocativum singularem quoque | 13 porro hoc si filiu' Luci ferit |
| 7 ii | collum ut Corneli Cornifici- |
| 8 corripit | que |

Apud codicem duplici ii (versu 2), corrumpi i (v. 6), ad pro ait (v. 10).

D. Marius Victorinus GL. VI 17, 21 ad 18, 10.

cum vero eadem i e litterae iuncta esset, non solum pro longa syllaba accipiebatur, sed nominativum pluralem ita scripta significabat, ut amicei bonei doctei Romanei et similia. at si per solum i scripta esset, eadem genetivum singularem faciebat ut huius amici et cetera. denique omnes qui de orthographia scripserunt de nulla scriptura tam diu quam diu de hac quaerunt, quae per i litteram singularem genetivum et [quae] per ei litteras nominativum pluralem faciat, locuti partim acute, *partim*, ut mihi quidem videtur, inepte, illud etiam ridicule (nam mihi quaedam succurrunt): pilum aiunt militare et vineam, si sit subter quam milites aggerem instituunt, et sicam [et silicem] quae secet per e et i scribenda; at si pilum sit quo pinsitores utuntur, et vinea quae ruri colitur et fistula per i. a quibus libenter quaererem, quo modo scripturi essent aedificii pila, et quo modo singularem discerne-

rent a plurali in his, res dies species, et his similibus. Sam-nitem, licet per omnes casus i longam custodiat, tamen nominativo correpta i *scribite*, ut sanguis pulvis.

E. Terentius Scaurus GL. VII 18, 23 ad 19, 12.

itemque quod Lucilius, ubi i exile est, per se iubet scribi, at ubi plenum est, praeponendum esse e credit his versibus,

mille . . . fiat (358-361).

quam inconstantiam Varro arguens in eundem errorem diversa via delabitur, dicens in plurali quidem numero debere litterae i e praeponi, in singulari vero minime, cum alioqui i non aliud in singulari quam *in plurali, neque aliud in media* quam in extrema syllaba sonet, ut in verbis manifestum est. dicimus enim 'mitto misi misimus', nisi aliam hic vult esse rationem [quod absurdum est], ut, cum verba quoque ex syllabis constent, ex diversa regula corrigantur.

F. Velius Longus GL. VII 55, 27 ad 57, 5.

hic quaeritur etiam an per e et i quaedam debeant scribi secundum consuetudinem graecam. non nulli enim ea quae producerentur sic scripserunt, alii contenti fuerunt huic productioni i longam aut notam dedisse. alii vero, quorum est item Lucilius, varie scriptitaverunt, siquidem in iis quae producerentur alia per i longam, alia per e et i notaverunt, velut differentia quaedam separantes, ut cum diceremus 'viri', si essent plures, per e et i scriberemus, si vero esset unius (*ita Muell. et Lachm.*; unus P) viri, per i notaremus; et Lucilius in nono

iam puerei . . . hoc unius fiet (364-366).

item

hoc illi . . . fiat (369-370).

idemque peila, quibus milites utuntur, per e et i scribenda existimat, at pilam qua pinsitur (pila in qua pinsetur P) per i. hoc mihi videtur supervacaneae esse observationis. nam si omnino in scribendo discernenda casuum numerorumque ambiguitas est, quid faciemus in his nominibus quorum scriptio discrimen non admittit, ut aedes sedes nubes, cum et una et plures eodem modo dicantur et scribantur? quid cum dicimus gestus fluctus portus, cum et genetivus singularis et nominativus et accusativus et vocativus pluralis eodem modo scribantur? quid denique in iis quae ambiguitatem habent inter nomina et verba, *ut* rotas feras? nam tam hae rotae rotas faciunt, quam roto rotas [rotat], et fera feras

et fero feras. sic nec aliter scribitur amor, et ex nomine facit amoris, ex verbo amaris. satis ergo collectum quaedam per e et i non debere scribi, sed tantum per i, cum apud Graecos quoque ex veteri illa consuetudine inveniantur nomina quae per i scribuntur, quamvis producte enuntientur.

G. Cassiodorus GL. VII 206, 21-27, ex L. Caecilio (*sic cd. pro* Caesellio) Vindice.

Luci magni magi cum in genetivis singularibus dicimus, interest quos nominativos habeant: proinde enim intererit, utrum per duo i an per unum debeant scribi. si lucus magnus magus sunt nominativi eorum, unum i in genetivo habebunt: plurali quoque nominativo et vocativo, sed et dativo et ablativo similiter scribentur. si autem Lucius Magnus magius proferantur, duo i in genetivo habebunt, Lucii Magnii magii, quod ipsum Lucilius adnotavit, cum a numero Numerius discerneret.

H. Beda de arte metrica GL. VII 251, 6-10
dicit enim Paulinus

oblectans inopem sensu fructuque peculii
quod si quis dixerit hic eum more antiquorum dactylum in fine
posuisse versiculi, legat quod idem alibi dicit,
excoluit biiugis laquearii et marmore fabri:

251, 16-20

Fortunatus:

Vincentii Hispaniae surgit ab arce decus.
cuius scansio versus par est praefati, nisi forte regulam Lucilii
secuti sunt, qui Lucium (*ita P¹F*, lucilium *P¹L et Keil*) et
Aemilium et cetera nomina, quae ante u habent i non solum in
vocativo, sed etiam in genetivo casu per unum i existimat scribi
posse.

F codex Friburgensis 199, nunc Monacensis 6399.

L codex Leidensis bibliothecae publicae 122.

P codex Parisinus Sangercanensis 1189.

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

III.—THE CONVENTIONS OF THE PASTORAL ELEGY.

Published ✓
The influence of the Greek and Latin Classics on the literature of Modern Europe is nowhere so definitely illustrated as in the history of pastoral poetry. The haunting melodies of the Greek pastoral and their graceful echoes in the Eclogues of Virgil have exercised a charm so captivating to later poets in this field that not only the general framework of the Classical models, but their very turns of phrase and tricks of style, and even the musical names they give to their rustic characters, have persisted through centuries of pastoral song.¹ I propose in this paper to point out the most striking illustrations of the Classical influence in the conventions which occur most frequently in a single form of the pastoral—the pastoral elegy or dirge, a lament for the death, the absence or the loss of one beloved.

Source ✓
The Greek examples are Theocritus' Woes of Daphnis, in the first Idyll, Bion's Death of Adonis, and Moschus' Lament for Bion; for Latin literature, we have Virgil's fifth and tenth Eclogues.² The publication of the editio princeps of Theocritus in Milan, in 1481, and the Aldine edition, which contained also the elegies of Bion and Moschus, in 1495, started the fashion of singing the loss of kin or friend in musical numbers studiously echoed from the dirges of Theocritus, Bion, Moschus and Virgil. In Italy, the late Fifteenth and the Sixteenth Century saw a surfeit

¹"In Pastoralism, literary tradition penetrates everywhere, like an atmosphere, softening the asperities of innovation and touching the contours even of work fashioned by a Shakespeare or a Milton with a halo of allusion and reminiscence" (C. H. Herford, in Preface to *English Pastorals*). Cf. the illustrative material collected in Professor Mustard's 'Later Echoes of the Greek Bucolic Poets', *American Journal of Philology*, XXX 245-283. I am indebted to this article, and more directly to the kindness of Professor Mustard, for valuable suggestions.

²The first eclogue of Nemesianus is an elegy of a sort, but it seems to have played little or no part in the tradition of the pastoral lament. The mediæval lament for Adalhard, Abbot of Corbeil (by Paschasius Radbertus), has recently been discussed by J. H. Hanford, *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXV (1910) 427.

of such elegies, composed now in Latin, now in Italian verse.¹ From Italy the fashion spread to Spain, where in the early Sixteenth Century this form was cultivated by Garcilaso de la Vega.²

In France, about the same time (1531) Clément Marot published his masterpiece—a pastoral elegy on the death of Madame Loyse de Savoye, one of the most highly finished and elaborate of the modern dirges. This poem was followed very closely as the model of Spenser's November; and from this time on the pastoral elegy was as popular in England as it had been in Italy.³

Ἦς δ' αἰπόλος . . . αἰπόλῳ ἔξοχ' ἐφκει. The distinguishing characteristic of the pastoral elegy is that its subject masquerades as a herdsman moving amid rustic scenes, as, for example, in Matthew Arnold's *Thyrsis*, where the restless temperament and troubled life of his poet friend become in pastoral metaphor:

He loved each simple joy the country yields,
He loved his mates; but yet he could not keep,
For that a shadow lour'd on the fields,
Here with the shepherds and the silly sheep.
Some life of men unblest
He knew, which made him droop, and fill'd his head.
He went; his piping took a troubled sound
Of storms that rage outside our happy ground;
He could not wait their passing, he is dead.

¹ I shall limit myself here to the more notable examples, those of Pontano, Sannazaro, Luigi Alamanni and Tasso. Pontano's *Meliseus*, a Latin eclogue in which he laments the death of his wife, is modeled after Virgil's fifth eclogue, but shows acquaintance with Moschus. Sannazaro's *Phyllis*, a lament in Latin for Carmosina, is also patterned freely after Virgil, but in the eleventh eclogue of the *Arcadia* he does little more than paraphrase the dirge of Moschus. Alamanni's first two eclogues, laments for his friend Rucellai, are paraphrased respectively from Theocritus' first Idyll and Moschus' *Death of Bion*. His tenth eclogue imitates closely Bion's dirge. Tasso's *Rogo di Corinna* abounds in echoes from Theocritus, Bion, Moschus and Virgil.

² His first two eclogues contain elegies of the conventional type.

³ Of the many instances of it in English, the following, which I mention in chronological order, are, perhaps, of greatest interest: the pastoral elegies by "A. W.", and by Francis Davison, published in Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody*; Spenser's *Astrophel*; Thomas Watson, *Meliboeus*; Drayton, *Eclogue IV* of the *Shepherd's Garland*; William Browne, *A Dirge, and Death of Philarete*; William Drummond, *Damon's Lament, and Pastoral Elegy on the Death of Sir William Alexander*; Ben Jonson, *Aeglamour's Lament*; Milton, *Lycidas*; Pope, *Fourth Pastoral*; Ambrose Philips, *Albino*; John Gay, *Friday, or the Dirge*; Shelley, *Adonais*; Matthew Arnold, *Thyrsis*. The tradition is continued freely in Reginald Fanshawe's *Corydon, an Elegy in Memory of Matthew Arnold and Oxford*.

This convention begins with Moschus. In the earliest example, the dirge of Theocritus, the subject of the song is really a herdsman and the dirge of Theocritus is perhaps little more than an idealized version of folk-songs he had heard Sicilian shepherds sing in honor of their rustic hero. The Adonis of Bion's elegy is also a shepherd divinity; but when we come to Moschus, the hero of the song is no longer a shepherd but the poet Bion, whose only connection with the pastoral life is that he wrote verses in the pastoral vein. Moschus adopts the form of Theocritus and Bion, and frankly makes a shepherd of his poet hero. Here we have for the first time, as Chambers¹ puts it, the pastoral form used to "express in poetic metaphor the sorrow of those who loved a singer and a friend. In our own literature it has become traditional for such a purpose. Again and again throughout the centuries

The same sweet cry no circling seas can drown
In melancholy cadence rose to swell
Some dirge of Lycidas or Astrophel,
When lovely souls and pure, before their time,
Into the dusk went down.

Philip Sidney and Edward King, John Keats and Arthur Clough, all alike cut off by an ineluctable fate in the flower of their days; for all alike the cadences of a half forgotten Greek poet have woven their imperishable memorial".

Frame-work of the Elegy. The dirge of Theocritus is preceded by a dramatic introduction. Two herdsmen interchange mutual compliments, and one is induced by flattery and the promise of a gift to sing the "Woes of Daphnis". After the dirge there is further talk, praise of the singer, and at the end a return to the commonplace of present reality. This is essentially the plan of Virgil's fifth eclogue, of the Latin dirges of Pontano and Sannazaro, of Alamanni's first eclogue, of Tasso's *Rogo di Corinna*, first part, of the *Elegies* of Garcilaso de la Vega, of Marot's *Complainte de Madame Loyse de Savoye*, of Spenser's *November*, of the pastoral elegies of Pope, Philips and Gay. The dirges of Bion and Moschus and Virgil's tenth eclogue lack this dramatic setting, and plunge at once into the theme or approach it by a short prelude or invocation. So, also, a number

¹ English Pastorals, Introduction, p. xliii.

of modern dirges; for example, Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, eleventh eclogue, Alamanni's second eclogue, Milton's *Lycidas*, Shelley's *Adonais*, M. Arnold's *Thyrsis*.

Refrain. A striking feature of the dirge of Theocritus is the refrain:

ἀρχετε βουκολικᾶς Μοῖσαι φίλαι, ἀρχετ' αἰοιδᾶς.

Bion also uses it:

αἰάζω τὸν Ἀδωνιν ἃπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνις,

and Moschus:

ἀρχετε Σικελικαί, τῷ πένθεος ἀρχετε Μοῖσαι.

The modern dirge employs it often: Sannazaro, *Arcadia*, Ecl. XI, "Ricominciate, Muse, il vostro pianto"; Alamanni, Ecl. I, "Date principio, o Muse, al tristo canto"; Ecl. II, "Piangete sempre homai, Sorelle Tosche"; Ecl. X, "Piangiamo Adon, che'l bello Adone è morto"; Tasso, *Corinna* (closing song), "Piangete, antiche Ninfe"; Garcilaso, Ecl. I (Salicio's song), "Salid sin duelo, lágrimas, corriendo"; Marot, "Chantez, mes vers, chantez"; Spenser, November, "O heavie herse! . . . O carefull verse!"; Milton, *Epitaphium Damonis*, "Ite domum impasti, domino iam non vacat, agni"; Pope, Fourth Pastoral, "Fair Daphne's dead and Beauty is no more"; Third Pastoral, "Resound ye hills, resound my mournful strain".

All Nature Mourns. The appeal to Nature to mourn or the representation of Nature as sharing in the universal sorrow is a commonplace almost never absent from the pastoral dirge. In Theocritus, the mountains and trees mourned for Daphnis. In Bion's elegy, mountains, trees, springs and rivers share in Aphrodite's sorrow for the lost Adonis, and the flowers flush red with pain. So in Moschus, all the flowers withered and the trees cast down their fruit for grief when Bion died. In Virgil's tenth eclogue, "the laurels and the tamarisks wept for Gallus, Mount Maenalus crowned with pines bemoaned him, and the rocks of chill Lycaeus". In the modern dirge this convention is employed often with extreme elaboration. Generally speaking, the ancient poets have "sowed with the hand, the modern, with the sack".¹ The dirge of Pontanus, some two hundred and fifty

¹ Moschus was the first to overdo it and is responsible, largely, for the sins of modern excess.

lines, is made up almost entirely of it,¹ and many later elegies are overcharged with Nature's tears and groans.² Of the saner uses of this "pathetic fallacy" I quote two examples, Spenser, *November*, who echoes Marot and Moschus:

Ay me! that dreerie Death should strike so mortall stroke,
That can undoe Dame Nature's kindly course;
The faded lockes fall from the loftie oak,
The flouds do gaspe, for dryed is theyr sourse,
And flouds of teares flowe in theyr stead perforce;
The mantled medowes mourne,
Theyr sondry colours tourne.
O heavie herse!
The heavens doe melt in teares without remorse;
O carefull verse!

and Shelley, *Adonais*:

All he had loved, and moulded into thought,
From shape, and hue, and odour, and sweet sound,
Lamented *Adonais*. Morning sought
Her eastern watch-tower, and her hair unbound,
Wet with the tears which should adorn the ground,
Dimmed the aerial eyes that kindle day;
Afar the melancholy thunder moaned,
Pale Ocean in unquiet slumber lay,
And the wild Winds flew round, sobbing in their dismay.

Grief made the young Spring wild, and she threw down
Her kindling buds, as if she Autumn were,
Or they dead leaves; since her delight is flown,
For whom should she have waked the sullen year?

¹ I quote a sample:

En squalent prata et sua sunt sine honore salicta,
Extinctamque Ariadnan agri, Ariadnan et ipsae
Cum gemitu referunt silvae, vallesque queruntur.
Extinctamque Ariadnam iterant clamantia saxa,
Et colles iterant Ariadnam, Ariadnan et amnes.

² Baptista Mantuanus, *Ecl.* III, contents himself with a reference to Ovid and Virgil:

te Padus et noster lugubri Mincius ore
cum Nymphis flevere suis, ut Thracius Hebrus
Orphea; te tristes ovium flevere magistri,
ut Daphnim luxisse ferunt; te pascua et agri
undique; et audita est totis querimonia campis.

(The *Eclogues* of Baptista Mantuanus, ed. W. P. Mustard, Baltimore, 1911, p. 129.)

In many cases Nature is challenged to reverse her usual course and let confusion reign. This convention begins with Theocritus: "Now bear violets ye brambles, bear violets ye thorns, and let the beautiful narcissus flower on the boughs of the juniper! Let all things with one another be confounded; let the pine tree bear pears since Daphnis is dying; let the stag drag down the hounds, and let owls from the hills vie with nightingales in song". So Pontanus, imitating Virgil's echo of this passage:

Dira lues coelo ruat, et ruat altus Olympus.
Stragem agris, stragem arboribus, terraeque ruinam
Det super et mediis tellus internatet undis.
Non uxor mihi cara domi.

Tasso, *Rogo di Corinna*, makes much of it:

Stelle, stelle crudeli,
Perchè non mi celate il vostro lume,
Poi che il suo m'ascondeste?
Perchè non volgi, o Luna, addietro 'l corso?
Perchè non copre intorno orrido nembo
Il tuo dolce sereno?
Perchè il ciel non si tigne
Tutto di nere macchie e di sanguigne?
Tenebre, o voi che le serene luci
M'ingombraste repente,
Coprite il cielo e i suoi spietati lumi,
E minaccino sol baleni e lampi
D'ardere il mondo e le celesti spere.
Stiasi dolente ascoso il Sol nell' onde;
Tema natura di perpetua notte;
Tremi la terra; ed Aquilone ed Austro
Facciano insieme impetuosa guerra,
Crollando i boschi, e le robuste piante
Svelte a terra spargendo; il mar si gonfi,
E con onde spumanti il lido ingombri;
Volgano i fiumi incontro ai fonti il corso.

Virgil, *Eclogue V*, complains of the decline of Nature's kindly powers: "Since the fates have reft us of thee (Daphnis), Pales and Apollo have themselves abandoned the fields. In the furrows to which we often entrusted the large barley seed, the accursed darnel and barren wild oats only spring. In place of the soft violet and the purple narcissus, rise the thistle and the

thorn". This passage is echoed again and again. Garcilaso imitates it at some length, Ecl. I :

Despues que nos dejaste nunca pace
En hartura el ganado ya, ni acude
El campo al labrador con mano llena.

La tierra que de buena
Gana nos producía
Flores con que solía
Quitar en solo vellas mil enojos,
Produce agora en cambio estos abrojos,
Ya de rigor de espinas intratable ;
Y yo hago con mis ojos
Crecer llorando el fruto miserable.

Also Tasso, *Corinna* :

Posciache t'involò l'acerba morte,
Pale medesma abbandonò piangendo
Le sue nude campagne, e seco Apollo :
E nei solchi, in cui già fu sparso il grano,
Vi signoreggia l'infelice loglio,
E la sterile avena, o felce appresso
Sventurata che frutto non produce ;
E in vece pur di violetta molle,
Di purpureo narciso e di giacinto.
Il cardo sorge.

And Ambrose Philips, *Albino* :

Since thou delicious youth didst quit the plains,
The ungrateful ground we till with fruitless pains,
In laboured furrows sow the choice of wheat
And over empty sheaves in harvest sweat.
A thin increase our fleecy cattle yield
And thorns and thistles overspread the field.

Ben Jonson, *Aeglamour's Lament*, uses the convention with more originality :

A spring, now she is dead ! of what ? of thorns,
Briars and brambles ? thistles, burs and docks ?
Cold hemlock, yew ? the mandrake or the box ?
These may grow still ; but what can spring beside ?
Did not the whole earth sicken when she died ?
As if there since did fall one drop of dew
But what was wept for her ! or any stock
Did bear a flower, or any branch a bloom,
After her wreath was made.

The beasts of field and forest also show their grief, especially the herds and flocks now left to roam without a shepherd. In Theocritus, the "jackals and the wolves cried for Daphnis; for him even the lion from the forest made lament; his bulls and kine with their young calves bewailed him". In Bion, the hounds of Adonis set up a woeful cry, and in Moschus, the herds of Bion refuse to graze. In Virgil's fifth Eclogue: "No shepherd pastured the herd, after the death of Daphnis, or drove it to the cool stream; no four-footed thing would taste of the river or touch the grassy sward". This becomes an almost universal convention in the later pastoral. For example, Pontanus:

Pastores Ariadnam, Ariadnam armenta querantur
Extinctamque Ariadnan opacis buccula silvis
Cum gemitu testetur;

Spenser, November: /

The feeble flocks in field refuse their former foode,
And hang theyr heads as they would learne to weepe;
The beastes in forest wayle as they were woode,

.
Now she is gone that safely did hem keepe;

Ambrose Philips:

No cattle grazed the field nor drank the flood.
Bleating around him lie his plaintive sheep.¹

The most interesting use of this convention is in Shelley's Adonais:

Oh weep for Adonais! . . . The quick Dreams,
The passion-winged Ministers of thought,
Who were his flocks, whom near the living streams
Of his young spirit he fed, and whom he taught
The love which was its music, wander not, . . .
Wander no more, from kindling brain to brain,
But droop there, whence they sprung; and mourn their lot
Round the cold heart, where, after their sweet pain,
They ne'er will gather strength, or find a home again.

¹ Cf. the burlesque in Gay's Friday:

When Blouzelind expired, the wether's bell
Before the drooping flock tolled forth her knell;
The solemn death watch clicked the hour she died,
And shrilling crickets in the chimney cried . . .
The lambkin which her wonted tendance bred
Dropped on the plains that fatal instant dead.

Πῇ ποκ' ἄρ' ἦσθ', δκα Δάφνις ἐτάκετο, πῇ ποκα Νύμφαι; The legendary Daphnis of Theocritus is the son of Hermes and a nymph. His childhood was passed among the nymphs, who brought him up. Thyrsis complains that they were not present when Daphnis was dying: "Where were ye, Nymphs, when Daphnis was wasting in death—O, where were ye? In Peneus' beautiful vales or in the vales of Pindus? For surely ye dwelt not by the great river Anapus nor on the watch-tower of Aetna nor by the sacred waters of Acis". This perfectly natural reproach in Theocritus becomes one of the most artificial conventions in the pastoral dirge. Virgil imitates it very closely in the tenth eclogue: "In what woods or glades were ye, Naiad Nymphs, when Gallus was dying of love? For not on Parnassus' slopes did ye linger, nor on the slopes of Pindus, nor by Aonian Aganippe". And so does Luigi Alamanni, Ecl. I:

Ov' eran tutte allor Grazie et Virtuti?
Ove voi, Muse, allor che la chiara alma
Del divin Cosmo al summo ciel salto?
Non già non già lungo le fresche rive
Del suo chiaro Arno, e non fra i verdi colli
Del suo fiorito nido; anzi lontane
Foste allor sì, che tardo fu'l soccorso
Di tôrre a morte quel cui tanto amaste.

Garcilaso, Ecl. I, imitates more freely:

Inexorable Diosa demandabas
En aquel paso ayuda;
Y tú, rústica Diosa, dónde estabas?
Ibate tanto en perseguir las fieras?

Marot's elegy has a slight echo:

Que faictes vous en ceste forest verte,
Faunes, Sylvains? je croy que dormez là;
Veillez, veillez, pour plorer ceste perte.

Baif, Ecl. II, Brinon, patterned after Virgil, Ecl. X, has an elaborate imitation, of which I quote the beginning:

Nymphes, quel mont lointain, quelle forest ombreuse,
Quel fleuve, quel rocher, quelle caverne creuse
Vos detint?

This becomes in Spenser's *Astrophel*:

Ah ! where were ye this while, his shepherd peares,
To whom alive was nought so deare as hee ?
And ye faire mayds, the matches of his yeares,
Which in his grace did boast you most to bee ;
Ah ! where were ye, when he of you had need.
To stop his wound that wondrously did bleed ?

Milton's *Lycidas* studiously echoes the classical models :

Where were ye, Nymphs, when the remorseless deep
Closed o'er the head of your loved Lycidas ?
For neither were ye playing on the steep
Where your old bards, the famous Druids, lie,
Nor on the shaggy top of Mona high,
Nor yet where Deva spreads her wizard stream.

Also Pope's *Second Pastoral* :

Where stray ye, Muses, in what lawn or grove,
While Corydon thus pines in hopeless love,
In these fair fields where sacred Isis glides
Or else where Cam his winding vales divides ?

Shelley's rendering is more free :

Where wert thou, mighty Mother, when he lay,
When thy Son lay, pierced by the shaft which flies
In darkness ? Where was lorn Urania
When Adonais died ?

Ἡνθον τοὶ βοῦται, τοὶ ποιμένες, ὅπολοι ἦνθον. I have already said that the Daphnis of Theocritus is of divine origin, the son of Hermes and a nymph. So Hermes naturally comes to Daphnis when he is dying, and asks him the cause of his torment. The neat-herds come, and the shepherds; the rustic Priapus also comes. All say, "Unhappy Daphnis, wherefore dost thou languish" ? This also becomes a very artificial formula. Virgil imitates it in the tenth Eclogue. Shepherds and swineherds, Menalcas among them, come to Gallus and ask, "Whence this love of yours ?" Apollo comes and questions, "Gallus, why so mad ?" Silvanus also comes, and Pan; all ask, "Will you ever put bounds to your tears ?" Alamanni, *Ecl.* I, imitates Theocritus :

Discese Apollo a noi dal suo Parnaso
Et piangendo dicea ; deh, miser Cosmo,

Dov' or ten vai? Chi di te 'l mondo spoglia?
Pan venne poi con mille altri pastori, etc.

Also Garcilaso, Ecl. II:

Vinieron los pastores de ganados;
Vinieron de los sotos los vaqueros,
Para ser de mi mal de mi informados.
Y todos con los gestos lastimeros
Me preguntaban, quáles habian sido
Los accidentes de mi mal primeros.

Marot has a somewhat fainter echo:

Nymphes et dieux de nuict en grand' destresse
La vindrent veoir.

Baïf, Ecl. II, in the passage beginning:

Tous les Dieux qui des chams ont le soin et la garde
Viennent de toutes pars,

expands the convention into fifty-four lines. Milton, Lycidas, elaborates it into the curiously involved passage beginning:

But now my oat proceeds
And listens to the Herald of the Sea,
That came in Neptune's plea.
He asked the waves, and asked the felon winds,
What hard mishap hath doomed this gentle swain.

More simply, Shelley, Adonais:

and the mountain shepherds came,
Their garlands sere, their magic mantles rent;
The Pilgrim of Eternity, whose fame
Over his living head like heaven is bent,
An early but enduring monument,
Came, veiling all the lightnings of his song
In sorrow. From her wilds Ierne sent
The sweetest lyrist of her saddest wrong,
And love taught grief to fall like music from his tongue.

'Midst others of less note came one frail Form, etc.

Garlands
"With fairest flowers . . . I'll sweeten thy sad grave". The command to deck the bier or the grave of the dead with garlands, or the representation of friends of the dead bringing flowers, occurs frequently. The tradition begins with Bion, where Aphrodite is enjoined to deck the bier of Adonis with flowers and wreaths, βάλλε δέ νιν στεφάνοις καὶ ἄνθεσι. In Virgil's fifth

eclogue the singer requests the shepherds to strew the ground with leaves and plant shade-giving trees about Daphnis' tomb:

Spargite humum foliis, inducite fontibus umbras . . .
Et tumulum facite.

Of this there are many brief echoes. For example, Baptista Mantuanus, Ecl. III:

Spargite, pastores, tumulum redolentibus herbis ;

Castiglione, Alcon :

Vos mecum, o pueri, bene olentes spargite flores,
Narcissum atque rosas et suave rubentem hyacinthum,
Atque umbras hedera lauroque inducite opacas:
Nec desint casiae permixtaque cinnama amomo,
Excitet ut dulces aspirans ventus odores.

Sannazaro, Phyllis :

tu coniferas ad busta cupressus
Sparge manu et viridi tumulum super intege myrto ;

Tasso, Corinna :

Di verdi fronde voi l'arida terra,
O pastori, spargete :
Fate il sepolcro, etc.

Pontano elaborates it somewhat:

Legite intactos et jungite flores
et solis luctum et pueri lachrymantis amorem.
Legite et abscissos Veneris de fronte capillos
Post ubi io Ariadnan io Ariadnan, et ipsum
Implestis clamore nemus, hunc addite honorem
Ad tumulum, pia verba acrem testantia luctum.

Marot turns it into a passage of lingering sweetness :

Portez rameaux parvenuz à croissance ;
Laurier, lyerre et lys blancs honorez,
Romarin vert, roses en abondance,
Jaune soucie et bassinetz dorez,
Passeveloux de pourpre colorez,
Lavende franche, oeilletz de couleur vive,
Aubepins blancs, aubepins azurez,
Et toutes fleurs de grand' beauté nayfve.
Chascune soit d'en porter attentive,
Puis sur la tumbe en jectez bien espais,
Et n'oubliez force branches d'olive,
Car elle estoit la bergere de paix.

From the English pastoral I cite two examples, William Drummond, *Elegy on the Death of Sir William Alexander* :

Fair nymphs, the blushing hyacinth and rose
Spread on the place his relics doth enclose ;
Weave garlands to his memory, and put
Over his hearse, a verse in cypress cut,

and the exquisite flower scene of Milton's *Lycidas* :

And call the vales, and bid them hither cast
Their bells and flowerets of a thousand hues.

To strew the laureate hearse where Lycid lies.

Riddle " *The Riddle of this Painful Earth*". There is expressed in almost every dirge, ancient or modern, a feeling of bitter resentment against the cruel fate which blasts life in the bud or cuts it off in the fullness of its flower.¹ Sometimes this is expressed as in the words Bion gives to Aphrodite : " Far thou fliest from me, Adonis. To Acheron thou goest, the loathed and cruel king of death. But I, unhappy, live, for I am a goddess and may not follow thee. Take thou my lord, Persephone, for thou art stronger than I, and all things fair descend to thee". Compare Tasso, *Corinna* :

Oh dolore, oh pietate!
Oh miseria del mondo!
Come passa repente e come fugge
Virtù, grazia, bellezza e leggiadria!

William Drummond, *Pastoral Elegy on the Death of Sir William Alexander* :

O death, what treasure in one hour
Hast thou dispersed ; how dost thou devour
What we on earth hold dearest ! All things good,
Too envious Heavens, how blast ye in the bud !

and Shelley, *Adonais* :

For he is gone where all things wise and fair
Descend. Oh dream not that the amorous deep
Will yet restore him to the vital air !

Death feeds on his mute voice, and laughs at our despair.

¹ Andrelinus, Menalcas : " invicta resecat mors improba falce ".

Lady Pembroke, *Astrophel* : " What cruel hand of cursed foe unknown
Hath cropped the stalk which bore so fair a
flower ? "

Milton, *Lycidas* : " Comes the blind Fury with the abhorred
shears ".

Sometimes the complaint is against the Heavens which allow such things to be, as in Virgil's fifth eclogue, where Daphnis' mother, clasping the dead body of her son, upbraids the gods and the stars for their cruelty. So Ambrose Philips, in close imitation of Virgil :

The pious mother comes with grief oppress'd :
 Ye trees and conscious fountains can attest
 With what sad accents, and what piercing cries,
 She filled the grove and importuned the skies,
 And every star upbraided with his death,
 When in her widowed arms, devoid of breath,
 She clasped her son.

Oftentimes the melancholy mood born of the sense of bereavement expresses itself in the form of a contrast drawn between the immortality of Nature's life and the mortality of man. "There is hope of a tree if it be cut down, that it will sprout again and that the tender branch will not cease. . . . But man dieth and wasteth away. Yea, man giveth up the ghost and where is he?" The earliest instance of this in the pastoral occurs in the splendid lines of Moschus' elegy : " Ah me ! the mallows when they fade and perish in the garden, and the green parsley and the fair-flowering tendrils of the anise, they awake to life again and grow, with the coming of another spring. But we, the human kind, the great, the mighty and the wise, when once we die, unheeding in the hollow earth we sleep . . . the long endless, never waking sleep". This contrast is one of the most natural and one of the most effective features of the dirge, and it is not surprising that it becomes one of the most striking conventions of the modern pastoral elegy. Here it occurs first in Sannazaro, *Arcadia*, Ecl. XI :

Ai, ai, seccan le spine, et poi che un poco
 Son state ad ricoprar l'antica forza,
 Ciascuna torna, e nasce al proprio loco ;
 Ma noi, poi che una volta il ciel ne sforza,
 Vento, nè sol, nè pioggia, o primavera
 Basta ad tornarne in la terrena scorza.¹

¹ Professor Mustard kindly calls my attention to a passage of Castiglione's *Alcon*, "which will remind the English reader of the splendid passage in *Lycidas* about the Day-star and the ocean bed" :

Vomeribus succisa suis moriuntur in arvis
 Gramina : deinde iterum viridi de cespite surgunt :
 Rupta semel non deinde annectunt stamina Parcae.

Alamanni, *Ecl.* II, also paraphrases Moschus :

Le liete rose, le fresche herbe e verdi,
 Le violette, i fior vermigli e' i persi
 Bene han la vita lor caduca e frale,
 Ma' l'aure dolci, i sol benigni e l'acque
 Rendon gli spirti lor che d'anno in anno
 Tornan piu che mai belli al nuovo aprile,
 Ma (lassi) non virtù, regni, o thesoro
 À noi render porrian quest' alma luce ;

and Tasso, *Corinna* :

Cade il bianco ligustro, e poi risorge,
 E di nuovo germoglia ;
 E dalle spine ancor purpurea rosa
 Còlta rinasce, e spiega
 L'odoroso suo grembo ai dolci raggi ;
 Spargono i pini e i faggi
 Le frondi a terra, e di lor verde spoglia
 Poi rivestono i rami ;
 Cade e risorge l'amorosa stella ;
 Tu cadesti, *Corinna* (ahi duro caso !)
 Per non risorger mai.

Marot's treatment of the convention is briefer :

D'où vient cela qu'on veoit l'herbe sechante
 Retourner vive, alors que l'esté vient,
 Et la personne au tumbeau trebuschante
 Tant grande soit, jamais plus ne revient ?

And Spenser, *November*, improves on Marot :

Whence is it, that the flouret of the field doth fade,
 And lyeth buryed long in Winters bale ;
 Yet, soone as spring his mantle hath displayde,
 It floureth fresh, as it should never fayle ?

Aspice, decedens iam Sol declivis Olympo
 Occidit, et moriens accendit sidera caelo ;
 Sed tamen occiduo cum laverit aequore currus,
 Idem iterum terras orienti luce reviset :
 Ast ubi nigra semel durae nos flumina mortis
 Lavere, et clausa est immitis ianua regni,
 Nulla umquam ad superos ducit via : lumina somnus
 Urget perpetuus tenebrisque involvit amaris.
 Tunc lacrimae incassum, tunc irrita vota precesque
 Funduntur. fert vota Notus lacrimasque precesque.

But thing on earth that is of most availe,
 As virtues braunch and beauties budde,
 Reliven not for any good.
 O heavie herse !¹

The most elaborate form of this commonplace is in Shelley's *Adonais* :

Ah woe is me ! Winter is come and gone,

 The airs and streams renew their joyous tone ;
 The ants, the bees, the swallows reappear ;
 Fresh leaves and flowers deck the dead Seasons' bier ;

 Alas ! that all we loved of him should be
 But for our grief, as if it had not been.

In Matthew Arnold's *Thyrsis* the convention is not so obvious :

He hearkens not ! light comer, he is flown !
 What matters it ? next year he will return,
 And we shall have him in the sweet spring-days,
 With whitening hedges, and uncrumpling fern,
 And blue-bells trembling by the forest-ways,
 And scent of hay new-mown.
 But Thyrsis never more we swains shall see ;
 See him come back, and cut a smoother reed,
 And blow a strain the world at last shall heed—
 For Time, not Corydon, hath conquer'd thee !

"*Peace, peace ! he is not dead*". If the pastoral dirge is mainly an expression of despair, it contains also an element of reassurance, of consolation, in the thought that the dead is not really dead but lives on in another world. There is a hint of this in the dirges of Bion² and Moschus,³ though the convention

¹ This convention occurs also in the elegies of "A. W." and Francis Davison, published in Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody*, where it plays a great part. In Davison's *Loss of Astraea's Favour*, the contrast is drawn with most elaborate though graceful fulsomeness. The whole elegy is made up of eleven recurring forms of it. In the eclogue entitled *Cuddy*, ascribed to "A. W.," the contrast is drawn four times. William Drummond employs it in both his elegies.

² *Death of Adonis*, 97, λῆγε γόνων Κυθήρεια τὸ σήμερον, ἰσχεο κομμῶν. This with Theocritus' change of the refrain toward the end of his elegy to λῆγετε βοῦκολικᾶς Μοῖσαι, ἴτε λῆγετ' αἰοιδᾶς no doubt suggested such transitional lines as Spenser's "Cease now, my Muse, now cease thy sorrowes sourse".

³ At the close of his lament, Moschus imagines his hero as continuing his song in Hades, and suggests that in reward for his sweet piping Persephone may send him back to his native hills—καὶ σὲ Βίων πέμψει τοῖς ὤρεσιν.

as it recurs in the modern pastoral dates mainly from the fifth *Eclogue* of Virgil. Here the elegy falls into two distinct songs by two shepherds: the first an expression of sorrow, the second of consolation, of gladness even; the first dwelling on Daphnis' death and the pity of it, the second, on his apotheosis, for Daphnis is not dead. He lives on in Olympus among the gods; nay, he is himself a god. This manner of treating the theme lent itself easily to imitation in the Christian pastoral, which regularly closes, as in a funeral service, with the thought of Heaven and the larger life. The transition from despair to reassurance is made either through the song of a second singer who bids the first cease his mournful strain and be comforted with happier thoughts,¹ or, when the dirge is one continuous song, through a sudden change of mood.²

The majority of modern pastoral elegies describe the blessedness of the dead in terms of classical religion and mythology, imitating and echoing Virgil closely,³ or mix Pagan imagery with Christian theology in a curious confusion.⁴ Sannazaro's *Phyllis* furnishes an illustration, which has the special interest of having influenced Milton:⁵

At tu, sive altum felix colis aethera, seu iam
Elysios inter manes coetusque verendos
Lethaeos sequeris per stagna liquentia pisces,
Seu legis aeternos formoso pollice flores,
.
Adspice nos, mitisque veni; tu numen aquarum
Semper eris, semper laetum piscantibus omen.

Of the more conventional use of this commonplace, perhaps the finest example is in Marot's elegy, the long passage beginning:

Non, taisez vous c'est assez deploré:
Elle est aux Champs Elisiens receue,

¹ For example, Ambrose Philips:

No more, mistaken Angelot, complain,
Albino lives, and all our tears are vain.

² Milton, *Lycidas*: "Weep no more woeful shepherds, weep no more"
Shelley, *Adonais*: "Peace, peace! he is not dead, he doth not sleep".

³ Tasso, for example, translates Virgil word for word. Pope and Ambrose Philips do little more.

⁴ So Milton, *Lycidas*.

So J. H. Hanford, *op. cit.*, 434.

to which Spenser's vaunted paraphrase

Why wayle we then ? why weary we the Gods with playnts,
As if some evill were to her betight ?

She raignes a goddesse now emong the saintes, etc.,¹

is altogether inferior. Shelley's use of the convention is worth all the rest. He turns it freely into a magnificent expression of his Platonizing spirit. Calm philosophy succeeds to bitter despair :

Peace, peace ! he is not dead, he doth not sleep—
He hath awakened from the dream of life—

He has outsoared the shadow of our night ;
Envy and calumny and hate and pain.
And that unrest which men miscall delight,
Can touch him not and torture not again ;
From the contagion of the world's slow stain
He is secure, and now can never mourn
A heart grown cold, a head grown gray in vain ;
Nor, when the spirit's self has ceased to burn,
With sparkless ashes load an unlamented urn.

He lives, he wakes—'tis Death is dead, not he ;
Mourn not for Adonais.—Thou young Dawn,
Turn all thy dew to splendour, for from thee
The spirit thou lamentest is not gone ;
Ye caverns and ye forests, cease to moan !
Cease, ye faint flowers and fountains, and thou Air,
Which like a mourning veil thy scarf hadst thrown
O'er the abandoned Earth, now leave it bare
Even to the joyous stars which smile on its despair

He is made one with Nature : there is heard
His voice in all her music, from the moan
Of thunder to the song of night's sweet bird ;
He is a presence to be felt and known
In darkness and in light, from herb and stone,
Spreading itself where'er that Power may move
Which has withdrawn his being to its own ;
Which wields the world with never-wearied love,
Sustains it from beneath, and kindles it above.

¹ The consolation in Gay's travesty is less conventional :

Thus wailed the louts in melancholy strain,
Till bonny Susan sped across the plain,
They seized the lass in apron clean arrayed
And to the ale-house forced the willing maid ;
In ale and kisses they forget their cares,
And Susan Blouzelinda's loss repairs.

In Matthew Arnold, as usual, the convention is less obvious :

To a boon southern country he is fled,
And now in happier air,
Wandering with the great Mother's train divine
(And purer or more subtle soul than thee,
. I trow, the mighty Mother doth not see)
Within a folding of the Apennine,

Thou hearest the immortal chants of old !—
Putting his sickle to the perilous grain
In the hot cornfield of the Phrygian king,
For thee the Lityerses-song again
Young Daphnis with his silver voice doth sing ;
Sings his Sicilian fold,
His sheep, his hapless love, his blinded eyes—
And how a call celestial round him rang,
And heavenward from the fountain-brink he sprang,
And all the marvel of the golden skies.

GEORGE NORLIN.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO.

IV.—REPEATED VERSES IN HOMER.

Few of the tests for determining the relative antiquity of the Iliad and the Odyssey have been regarded as more decisive than the test furnished by repeated verses, the so-called *Wiederholungen*. This has been the subject of numerous investigations and, in spite of the work by Rothe, *Die Bedeutung der Wiederholungen fuer die Homerische Frage* 1890, continues to be a favorite support for the doctrine of modern Chorizontes, as may be seen from two recent works in English, *Monro, Odyssey XII-XXIV* (1901) 327 ff., where a long list of examples is given to show that there are borrowings from the Iliad by the Odyssey, but none of the reverse; *Browne, Handbook of Homeric Study* (1905), p. 101, where discussing the Odyssey the author says, "We have still remaining a fairly decisive criterion of lateness in the borrowing of passages from one position in the poems to another. The borrowings are always found to be from the Iliad to the Odyssey, never vice versa".

It is no criticism on either of these scholars to say that they did not reach these conclusions for themselves, but accepted as true the statements given by Sittl, *Die Wiederholungen in der Odyssee*, Munich, 1882, and Gemoll, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Ilias und Odyssee*, *Hermes* (1883) XVIII, 34 ff. Although many other works on Homeric repetitions have appeared it will be sufficient for the purposes of this paper to refer to these two only. The literature on this subject is given by Professor Rothe, *Ilias als Dichtung* 1910, pp. 22 ff., with whose arguments and conclusions I am in entire accord.

I hope in this paper to show that the facts have been distorted and that repetitions have in general been omitted whenever they do not seem to lend support to the theory of the Separatists. It would be idle to apply my investigations to the Doloneia or to the last two books of the Iliad, since the answer would be that these books are notoriously late and might well belong to a period subsequent to the oldest parts of the Odyssey, and so accordingly this discussion will be limited to a book at the centre

of the Achilleid, the Patrocleia, or book sixteen. I shall first give the parallels discovered by Sittl and Gemoll, then some that were apparently discovered by neither.

Sittl found four passages or phrases in the Odyssey which he regarded as borrowed from Π . (Under the heading 16 Gesang.)

Π 233 τηλόθι ναίων

vgl. μ 135 τηλόθι ναίειν an derselben Stelle des Hexameters.

In letzterem Verse ist die Verbindung der Infinitive ἀπὸκισε ναίειν φυλασσέμεναι unleidlich und wohl auch sonst aus Homer nicht nachzuweisen. No such a difficulty as Sittl supposes exists in the verse in the Odyssey. The note of Ameis-Hentze hints at nothing unusual, "ναίειν ausführender Infinitiv der Folge, aber φυλασσέμεναι Infinit. der Absicht". The passage is not referred to in the Grammar of Monro or the Syntax of Stahl, while Ogden, De Infinitivi Finalis Constructione, p. 16, mentions it only in a long list of examples of similar construction. Such a simple combination as τηλόθι ναίω whether as infinitive or participle must have originated long before Homer, so that it was a commonplace in either poem.

The second reference to this book given by Sittl is ;

Π 289; ὁ δ' ὑπτιος ἐν κονίῃσιν—κάππεσεν οἰμῶξας,
σ 398; αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' οἰμῶξας πέσεν ὑπτιος ἐν κονίῃσιν.

Ich möchte bezweifeln, dass einer, der an der Hand verletzt wird, zu Boden stürzt, und berufe mich auf den analogen Fall einer Uebertreibung, den Christ in der Ilias aufgedeckt hat.

Homer uses χεῖρ in the sense of arm as well as hand, e. g.

Z 81: πρὶν αὐτ' ἐν χερσὶ γυναικῶν
φεύγοντας πεσέειν.

A foot-stool might easily strike a person with such force on the arm as to knock him down. It was no hero who was felled thus, but only the cup-bearer, οἰνοχόος.

Sittl's third reference is ;

Π 346; νύξε τὸ δ' ἀντικρὺ δόρυ χάλκεον ἐξεπέρησε,
κ 162; πλῆξα τὸ δ' ἀντικρὺ δόρυ χάλκεον ἐξεπέρησε,

Wenn Erymas von einem Wurfspiesse in den Mund getroffen wird, durchbohrt natürlich der Speer den Schlund und tritt dann hinten heraus. Welche riesige Kraft müsste aber ein Jäger

besitzen, um einen grossen Hirsch mit dem Speere am Rückgrate so zu treffen, dass die Spitze auf der entgegengesetzten Seite—an welchem Punkte, erfahren wir hier nicht—herauskommt. Was den sprachlichen Ausdruck betrifft, so ist *πλῆξα* nur eine schlechtere Lesart für *νύξε*, da Homer jenes Wort nur vom Schwertschlage anwendet. The setting in the Odyssey is as follows: Some god in sympathy for Odysseus causes a stag to meet him face to face, *εἰς ὁδὸν αὐτῆν*; as the stag turned from his course, *ἐκβαίνοντα*, Odysseus thrust him, *πλῆξα*, on the centre of the back right at the spine and the spear went on through. "Through what?" asks Sittl. Most likely through the thing struck, through the stag's spine. However large the stag was, it was not too large for Odysseus to pick it up and carry it on his back to the ship. A man can surely thrust a spear through the spine or the body of a stag which he is able to carry on his shoulders.

Sittl objects to the use of *πλῆξα* on the ground that this word is used exclusively of blows given by a sword. This verb is used of the blows delivered by any instrument held in the hand. Cf. e. g. B 265:

σκήπτρῳ δὲ μετάφρενον ἥδ' ἐκὼ πλῆξεν.

In the present passage Homer is everywhere consistent, Odysseus thrust the stag, *πλῆξα*, and stepping on the body drew the spear from the wound, *ῥτειλή*, which is the technical word for a wound made by a thrust and not by a hurled missile. To read into this passage that Odysseus hurled the spear and then find difficulties therein, is to assign to Homer an idea which he denies not only by the setting, since there is no reference to Odysseus coming up to the slain stag, but especially by the specific use both of *πλῆξα* and *ῥτειλή*.

The fourth and last parallel mentioned by Sittl is;

Π 775; *μαρναμένων ἀμφ' αὐτόν· ὁ δ' ἐν στροφάλιγγι κονίης
κεῖτο μέγας μεγαλωστί λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων.*

ω 39; *μαρνάμενοι περὶ σείω· σὺ δ' ἐν στροφάλιγγι κονίης
κεῖσο μέγας μεγαλωστί λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων.*

In der zweiten Nekyia fehlt die Pointe von *λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων*, Achilles lenkte ja seinen Wagen nicht selber, während Keb- riones in der That *ἵπποσυνάων ἐν εἰδῶς* erscheint. To deny to Achilles this particular skill is to miss the whole tone of the Iliad. The heroes themselves, not their drivers, were the skilled horsemen, and Achilles above all others. When Achilles planned

the races he excused himself from participation on the ground that if he took part there could be no doubt of the outcome ;

Ψ 274; εἰ μὲν νῦν ἐπὶ ἄλλῳ ἀθλεύοιμεν Ἀχαιοί,
ἢ τ' ἂν ἐγὼ τὰ πρῶτα λαβὼν κλισίηνδε φεροίμην·
ἴστε γάρ, ὅσσον ἔμοι ἀρετῇ περιβάλλετον ἵπποι.

In the chariot-race which followed the chieftains were the contestants and were called the knights. Cf. the words of Apollo, P 75 ff. : Ἐκτορ, νῦν σὺ μὲν ὧδε θέεις, ἀκίχητα διώκων, | ἵππους Αἰακίδαο δαΐφρονος· οἱ δ' ἀλεγεινοὶ | ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι δαμήμεναι ἢ δ' ὀχέεσθαι | ἄλλῳ γ' ἢ Ἀχιλῆϊ, κτλ. After the death of Patroclus Achilles returning to battle addressed his horses thus ;

T 401 ; ἄλλως δὲ φράζεσθε σωσέμεν ἥνιοχῆα κτλ.

Here the driver can be none other than Achilles, but Homer removes any possible doubt in verse 424, after Achilles tells his horse Xanthus he need not foretell his doom, since he has already been warned ;

ἢ ῥα καὶ ἐν πρώτοις ἰάχων ἔχε μώνυχας ἵππους.

Yet in the face of this we are assured that "Achilles lenkte ja seinen Wagen nicht selber". Throughout the Iliad the drivers are merely subordinate, they hold the whip, yoke up the horses, hold them while the great men fight, but as already said, the skilled horsemen are the heroes themselves.

While Sittl was preparing his investigation Gemoll was independently at work on the same subject, but did not print his results until he had compared them with the published work of Sittl's, so that the production of Gemoll's is both an original contribution and a running comment on the earlier publication.

Gemoll, Hermes 1883, 24 ff., found 136 examples of borrowing from one poem by the other ; "Mein Resultat ist folgendes: unter den 136 Stellen sind nur drei und zwar in die Ilias später eingeschoben in welchen sich die Odyssee als Original erweist". No one of these three passages is connected with the book now under consideration, the Patrocleia, so they do not require discussion here.

Of the four passages given by Sittl, as already quoted, Gemoll saw traces of imitation from the Iliad to the Odyssey in but one, the last one given, and like Sittl bases his argument on the impropriety of assigning skill in horsemanship to Achilles.

However he gives two other examples of imitation not mentioned in the earlier treatise. P. 71, Auf des Patroklos Bitte: "Wenn du eine *θεοπροπίη* vermeidest und die Mutter dir wohl von Zeus Bescheid brachte, so entsende mich", entgegnet Achill:

Π 50; οὔτε θεοπροπίης ἐμπάζομαι, ἦντινα οἶδα,
οὔτε τί μοι παρ Ζηνὸς ἐπέφραδε πότνια μήτηρ.

α 409 fragt Eurymachos den Telemach, ob der Fremde (Mentes) eine Botschaft gebracht oder in eigener Noth gekommen sei, und Telemach antwortet:

414; οὐτ' οὖν ἀγγελίη ἐτι πείθομαι, εἰ ποθεν ἔλθοι,
οὔτε θεοπροπίης ἐμπάζομαι, ἦντινα μήτηρ . . . ἐξερέηται.

Nach der *θεοπροπίη* war nicht gefragt, und die zweite Frage nach dem Reisezweck des Mentes wird ueberhaupt nicht beantwortet.

Telemachos in his reply wishes to emphasize the certainty he feels that his father cannot return, so he refuses to believe in the two sources of hope or information, namely messages and prophecies. How eagerly Penelope sought for any tidings of her husband is shown by her treatment of the disguised Odysseus and by the words of Eumaeus;

ξ 126; δς δέ κ' ἀλγυεύων Ἰθάκης ἐς δῆμον ἱκῆται,
ἐλθὼν ἐς δέσποιναν ἐμὴν ἀπατήλια βάζει·
ἢ δ' εὖ δεξαμένη φιλέει καὶ ἑκάστα μεταλλᾷ,

Gemoll's second objection that Telemachos did not answer the question in regard to the purpose of the stranger's visit shows utter lack of poetic comprehension. Eurymachos' questions are:

α 406; ὁππόθεν οὗτος ἀνὴρ· ποίης δ' ἐξ εὐχεται εἶναι
γαίης; ποῦ δέ νύ οἱ γενεὴ καὶ πατρίς ἄρουρα;
ἢ τί ν' ἀγγελίην πατρὸς φέρει ἐρχομένοιο,
ἢ ἔδν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος ἐελδόμενος τόδ' ἱκάνει;

The answers to these questions are:

417; ξεῖνος δ' οὗτος ἐμὸς πατρώιος ἐκ Τάφου ἐστίν,
Μέντης δ' Ἀγχιάλαιο δαΐφρονος εὐχεται εἶναι
υἱός, ἀτὰρ Ταφίοισι φιληρέτμοισιν ἀνάσσει.

Every detail except the last is answered; the name, the land, the parentage, the occupation of the stranger is given, but no poet could have ruined his poem right at the start by

permitting Telemachus to reveal the purpose of the visit as given in 294 ;

φράζεσθαι δὲ ἔπειτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν,
ὅππως κε μνηστῆρας ἐνὶ μεγάροισι τεοῖσιν
κτείνης ἢ δόλῳ ἢ ἀμφοδόν

If Telemachus had told this to the suitors, as demanded by Gemoll, there could be no Odyssey such as we now have. Gemoll's other example of borrowing from the Patrocleia is

Π 779; ἥμος δ' ἥελιος μετενίσσεται βουλευτόνδε
καὶ τότε δὴ κτλ.

These words occur also ι 56. No comment is made to show why the Odyssey contains the borrowed passage. In the Iliad this verse causes the greatest difficulty, as it describes a time of day closely akin to

Λ 84; ὄφρα μὲν ἤως ἦν καὶ ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἡμῶν κτλ.

Since the time mentioned in the earlier book there have been many hours of fighting, so we are surprised to find that it is still early in the afternoon. In the Odyssey there is no difficulty, the Kikones come early in the day, the Greeks though outnumbered hold them off during the morning and until noon, but finally exhausted in the afternoon they are defeated and flee.

In no passage given by Sittl or by Gemoll is there a cogent reason for assuming any verse of the Patrocleia is copied or borrowed by the Odyssey.

However there are other verses in the Patrocleia similar to verses in the Odyssey, and these Sittl and Gemoll have discreetly omitted.

Π 466; Σαρπηδὼν δ' αὐτοῦ μὲν ἀπήμβροτε δουρὶ φαεινῷ
δεύτερος ὀρμηθεὶς, ὃ δὲ Πήδασον οὐτάσεν ἵππον
ἐγχει δεξιὸν ὤμων· ὃ δ' ἐβραχε θυμὸν αἰσθων,
καὶ δ' ἔπεσ' ἐν κονίῃσι μακρῶν, ἀπὸ δ' ἔπτατο θυμός.

Here we have the anomalous use of οὐτάσει in the sense of βάλλω, meaning to wound by hurling, not by a weapon held in the hand. Cf. Lehrs De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis³, p. 52, "Βάλλειν non dicitur nisi de hasta vel sagitta vel omnino de missili quod eminus iactatur, itaque distinguitur ab οὐτάσαι, τύψαι, νύξαι, πλῆξαι, quae contra nusquam dicuntur nisi de vulneribus cominus illatis. Is, Didymus, cum librum de Aristarchi editio-

nibus Homeri conscriberet, unum repperit locum, huic vocabulorum usui absonum. Scilicet Π 467 de Sarpedone legitur

ὁ δὲ Πήδασον σῦτασεν ἵππον,

cum ex antecedente versu pateat Sarpedonem hastam torsisse". Lehrs gives quotations from Aristonicus and Didymus which show that they recognized that here Homeric usage had been violated.

The difficulty, so evident in the Iliad, does not appear in the parallel verses in the Odyssey :

τ 449; ὁ δὲ μιν φθάμενος ἔλασεν σῦς
γουνὸς ὑπερ, πολλὸν δὲ διήφυνσε σαρκὸς ὀδόντι
λκριφίς αἶξας, οὐ δ' ὀστέον ἵκετο φρενός.
τὸν δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς οὕτῃσιν εὐτυχῶν κατὰ δεξιὸν ὤμον,
καὶ δ' ἔπεσ' ἐν κονίῃσι μακρῶν, ἀπὸ δ' ἔπτατο θυμός.

These verses describe the fight of Odysseus with the wild boar and tell how he received the wound. The boar rushed at Odysseus, tore his leg with his tusk, and in the struggle at close quarters Odysseus thrust him with the spear. They were so near each other that Odysseus could not have hurled the spear but must have held it in his hand. If there be borrowing in these two passages the original can hardly be in doubt. It is remarkable that both Sittl and Gemoll overlooked these long parallel passages.

Π 742; ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἀρνευτήρι ἐοικώς
κάππεσ' ἀπ' εὐεργέος δίφρου, λίπε δ' ὀστέα θυμός.

This is the description of the fall of Cebriones when struck by a rock hurled by Patroclus. The Homeric chariot was only a low vehicle, not reaching to the warrior's knee, so that a plunge, or rather a fall, on dry ground from so low a platform gave little occasion for the comparison with a diver, yet this scant occasion is made less by the fact that Cebriones did not go head first, but tumbled over backwards, since the blow was straight in front.

737; βάλε δ' Ἑκτόρος ἡνιοχῆα
ἵππων ἡνί' ἔχοντα, μετώπιον ὀξείῃ λαῖ.
ἀμφοτέρως δ' ὀφρῖς σύνελεν λίθος, κτλ.

The comparison with the diver is found in the Odyssey ;

μ 411; ὁ δ' ἄρα πρυμνῇ ἐνὶ νηὶ
πλήξε κυβερνήτew κεφαλὴν, σὺν δ' ὀστέ' ἀραξε
πάντ' ἀμυδὶς κεφαλῆς· ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἀρνευτήρι ἐοικώς
κάππεσ' ἀπ' ἱκριόφιν, λίπε δ' ὀστέα θυμός ἀγήνωρ.

This is the description of the plunge made by the helmsman when struck by a bolt from Zeus he was thrown headlong from the deck into the sea. Everything in this passage, the lofty deck, the headlong plunge, the sea itself suggested the comparison with a diver. In the *Odyssey* the simile is original and natural, in the *Iliad* it is forced and unnatural. The passage in the *Iliad* may have been suggested by some previous poem which contained a description similar to the one in the *Odyssey*. It is out of place in the *Patrocleia*, but was dragged in so as to give occasion for the jest that Cebriones might support many by diving for oysters.

If there be original and copy in the use of this simile the *Iliad* surely contains the copy. Oddly enough this evident parallel escaped both Sittl and Gemoll.

Π 548; Τρῶας δὲ κατὰ κρήθεν λάβε πένθος,
λ 588; δένδρεα δ' ὑψιπέτηλα κατὰ κρήθεν χέε καρπόν,

In the *Odyssey* κατὰ κρήθεν is used in its literal sense, the fruit hung or dropped over the head of Tantalus, in the *Iliad* the use is figurative and the original force of the phrase is lost. As the literal use of a word or phrase must precede the transferred or figurative, so the passage in the *Odyssey* is nearer the source of κατὰ κρήθεν than the one in the *Iliad*.

A similar relation exists between the two following:

Π 66; εἰ δὴ κυάνεον Τρώων νέφος ἀμφιβέβηκε
μ 74; οἱ δὲ δύνω σκόπελοι ὁ μὲν οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἱκάνει
ὀξείῃ κορυφῇ, νεφέλῃ δὲ μιν ἀμφιβέβηκε
κυανέῃ.

In the *Odyssey* it is a real, a literal cloud, in the *Iliad* the expression is figurative and derived. Whether one passage in Homer be derived from the other or not, the expression in the *Iliad* presupposes just such a verse as we have in the *Odyssey*.

These few parallel passages, not discussed in previous publications, show how little truth there is in the statement, "The borrowings are always from the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey* and never the reverse", and also show how biased the application of this theory has been, since the argument which makes the *Odyssey* dependent on the *Iliad* reverses itself and with equal force makes the *Iliad* dependent on the *Odyssey*. These parallels, taken from a single book, do not prove that the *Odyssey* is older than

the Iliad, but they do show the worthlessness of the investigations conducted by Sittl and Gemoll.

Homer and his predecessors must have had a great store of similes, descriptions, and narratives from which they freely drew; the original passage may be incorporated in many parts of Homer, e. g., the description of a headlong plunge from the deck and the comparison with a diver may well be repeated in the original form in the passage in the Odyssey, quoted above, since a description so natural must have originated long before Homer. This very traditional description may have suggested the comparison with a diver in describing the fall of Cebriones, or, more probably, the poet forced the comparison in order to introduce the sarcastic reference to diving for oysters. However this may be, there can be no doubt that the comparison in the Odyssey is far nearer the original simile, if it be not itself that very original.

A similar explanation applies to all the passages I have quoted.

CONCLUSION.

The repeated verses furnish no indication of the relative antiquity of the Iliad and the Odyssey, a traditional description may fit better now in one poem now in the other, but this does not prove as far as they are mutually concerned imitation or dependence.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

V.—NOTES ON JUVENAL.

3. 13-16.

Nunc sacri fontis nemus ac delubra locantur
Iudaeis quorum cophinus faenumque supellex,
omnis enim populo mercedem pendere iussa est
arbor et eiectis mendicat silva Camenis.

The word *mercedem* reminded Mommsen (Sybel's Hist. Zeitschrift 64. 425 f. n. 3) of Vespasian's provision that the Jews should pay a fixed sum to Jupiter Capitolinus for the privilege of worshipping in the synagogues. Hence he assumed that a synagogue was located in the grove of Egeria. Juvenal's words, however, do not readily lend themselves to this interpretation. The money in question was paid, not into the treasury of Jupiter Capitolinus, but to the "people", i. e., into the *aerarium Saturni*. Again, if the money was paid for the privilege of visiting the synagogues, in what sense was it paid by "every tree"? We can scarcely take *omnis arbor* to mean "every (sacred) grove", for the rest of the sentence, as well as the entire passage, refers to one grove specifically—i. e., to that of Egeria. The same phrase makes difficulty for the theory that the Jews made their homes in the grove. Did they actually depend for shelter on the trees instead of on roofs?

The word *mendicat*, too, is suggestive. The Jews did not live in the grove, I think, and they did not visit it to worship: they were there to make a living. We need not, however, insist upon the literal meaning of the verb. The dividing line between modern beggars and the vendors of chewing gum, lead pencils, and shoe strings is very narrow, and the victims usually do not care to distinguish them at all. Probably these Jews were petty tradesmen. The *cophinus*,¹ then, was used to hold their wares,

¹ The current notion that the *cophinus* was characteristic of the Jews rather than of pedlers is as old as the time of Sidonius Apollinaris (Ep. 7. 6. 4). The idea was probably derived from a mistaken understanding of the passage we have before us and of its echo in 6. 542. It is well known that Juvenal was an author familiar to educated men in Sidonius' day. See id. Carm. 9. 269-273, and compare Amm. Marc. 28. 4. 14, and Rut. Nam. 1. 603 f.

and the hay served as a seat. Compare the beggar's mat of 5. 8 and 9. 140.

The reason why tradesmen chose this spot is suggested by Umbricius' purpose in tarrying here. Many carts besides his were undoubtedly loaded and unloaded near the gate during the first ten hours of the day; the spot was analogous to a modern railway station, at least in so far as it furnished a large number of possible buyers with a few moments to spare. Both buyers and sellers would find the shade of the grove agreeable, and so the poet found a tradesman established under every tree.

The *merces*, accordingly, was a license fee paid into the *aerarium* by the Jews for the privilege of selling their wares in the sacred grove. I do not know of any other reference to a license fee paid by tradesmen or by beggars either; but it is probable that the Romans did not totally neglect so obvious a way of collecting revenue from the foreigners in the city.

3. 254 ff.

Scinduntur tunicæ sartæ modo. Longa coruscat
serraco veniente abies, atque altera pinum
plaustra vehunt, nutant alte populoque minantur.

The editors understand that the accident to the *tunicæ* is due to the confusion caused by the approach of the wagons, and so they punctuate with a comma or a colon after *modo*. There is, however, nothing to indicate that Juvenal felt any more connection between these two sentences than between the first of them and the preceding one. In this lively account of a journey through the streets some incidents are recounted at length, others as briefly as possible. Compare the sentence, *Pinguia crura luto*, in line 247, which has no connection with what precedes or follows, and should therefore be set off by periods. We might hesitate to ascribe such unevenness of treatment to another poet, but it is quite in Juvenal's manner (cf. Friedländer, p. 48).

It is not quite clear whose tunics are meant. Perhaps a number of people in the crowd are in the same plight (note the word *populo* two lines below). But in that case it is surprising that every one of the torn garments had been recently mended. It seems better to assume that they belong to the speaker¹ (cf. *mihi*

¹ The use of two tunics by one person was common at all periods. In addition to the passage from Pliny cited in the text, see Plaut. Pseud. 1298, Hor. Sat. 1. 2. 25, Prop. 5. 2. 28.

in line 248). After he has turned his attention from the heavily laden slave and before he catches sight of the huge builders' wagons he has just time to note that he has suffered an accident which Pliny tells us is not uncommon in a crowd (Ep. 4. 16. 2). So he exclaims, "There! I've torn those tunics again!"¹

7. 82-87.

Curritur ad vocem iucundam et carmen amicae
Thebaidos, laetam cum fecit Statius urbem
promisitque diem; tanta dulcedine captos
adficit ille animos tantaque libidine volgi
auditur; sed cum fregit subsellia versu,
esurit, intactam Paridi nisi vendit Agaven.

Lewis translates *fregit subsellia* by "has made the benches resound" and compares 1. 13, *assiduo ruptae lectore columnae*, "the columns riven by the eternal reader" (so others, e. g., Weidner). But the emotional tone of the two passages is utterly different. In the first satire Juvenal has quite lost patience with the reciters and we are not surprised at some hyperbole in the account of the damage they do; but here his sympathies are with Statius: he certainly does not mean that the reciter's voice is so loud or his performance so long drawn out as to break the benches.

Another interpretation, which goes back to the fourth or fifth century,² supposes that the auditors became so excited in their applause that they destroyed the furniture. Such an occurrence would be natural enough at a chariot race or a gladiatorial contest or even at a contest between rival poets in case the contestants each had a strong following. It is worth noting, however, that there is no record of damage done by the applause of the spectators at any such contest. It has been reserved for Anglo-Saxon college students, under the excitement of a foot-ball victory, to build a bon-fire in the grand stand. Even with all due allowance for the much maligned Italian temperament, it seems incredible that the mild and rather tedious good taste of Statius' poems should have caused such a commotion. But, to waive this point

¹ Since this note was written, there has appeared in CW. 4. 53 a translation of the passage by Prof. F. S. Dunn, who understands it as I do, although he inadvertently writes "tunic" instead of tunics."

² Scholiast ad loc., as cited by Friedländer. Sidonius Apollinaris, Ep. 5. 10. 2, and Martianus Capella, 5. 436, use phrases that seem to reflect the same understanding of Juvenal's expression.

for the moment, is it necessary to impute such shockingly poor manners to the audiences at recitations in the first century? That applause was sometimes carried too far appears from Gellius 5. 1, where Musonius is quoted as saying that the auditors at a lecture on philosophy ought to express their approval quietly, not by shouting and gesticulation. Musonius, however, does not find it necessary to warn them against damaging the furniture. And in the passage before us Juvenal does not show Musonius' condemnatory attitude toward the occurrence he is describing. For once he is not writing in satirical vein; he finds no fault with Statius, and none with his hearers except that they do not pay.

The whole point of the passage is Statius' popularity. He draws such a crowd that their sheer weight breaks down the benches, as modern floors sometimes sink. Suetonius, Tiber. 40, says that on one occasion more than twenty thousand persons lost their lives upon the collapse of an amphitheatre, due, presumably, to overcrowding. That the tiers of seats provided for recitations were liable to similar accidents is shown by Suet. Claud. 41, where we are told of a recitation at which several benches were broken down *obesitate cujusdam*, to the very great confusion of the reader.

7. 126-128.

—atque ipse feroci
bellatore sedens curvatum hastile minatur
eminus et statua meditatur proelia lusca.

Mayor understands *lusca* to mean that one eye is closed for the sake of helping the aim. Aside from the difficulty of getting such a meaning out of the word, we should remember that aiming a spear is a very different matter from aiming a gun: there would be no advantage in closing one eye. Friedländer is surely right in assuming that the statue is in need of repairs. Compare the references to broken statues of grandees at the beginning of the eighth satire. I follow Duff in his similar interpretation of *curvatum*; the spear had been bent by accident.

As usual, the poet is not content with a single slur upon his victim. Aemilius has the warlike ambitions of Domitian's Praetorian Praefect, of whom Juvenal says in similar phrase (4. 112).

Fuscus marmorea meditatus proelia villa.

But he hurls his spear *eminus*—here in his own house, at a safe

distance from the foe;¹ and besides it is only the dilapidated statue that is in the fight.

8. 76 f.

Miserum est aliorum incumbere fama,
ne conlapsa ruant subductis tecta columnis.

It was quite as impossible in ancient times as it is today for anyone in real life to pull down a roof by leaning against the supporting columns. Juvenal is certainly alluding to some mythical exploit of a man of extraordinary strength.

So far as we know, only two such stories were current in antiquity: Samson's destruction of the temple in Gaza (Judges 16. 29 f.), and the Greek story of Cleomedes of Astypalaea. Cleomedes was deprived of his prize in a boxing contest because he had killed his opponent. Crazy with disappointment he went into the school in his native town and overturned the column which supported the roof. The boys were killed, and Cleomedes had to flee for his life. The story makes its appearance in the extant literature in Plutarch Romulus 28,² but Plutarch refers to it as already familiar.

It is probable that Juvenal knew this Greek legend, but in some respects his lines fit better with the Hebrew story: *columnis* is in the plural; the context distinctly implies disaster to the man who pushes the columns down, whereas Cleomedes seems to have escaped unharmed. There is no difficulty in supposing that the poet had heard the story of Samson. He repeatedly displays a rather extensive though superficial knowledge about the Jews, as, for example, in 14. 96-106. Once, in fact, we seem to have an allusion to the book of Judges. In 6. 546 f. the Jewish fortune-teller is described as

interpres legum Solymarum et magna sacerdos
arboris ac summi fida internuntia caeli.

In commenting on the phrase *magna sacerdos arboris*, Duff says that Juvenal "cannot have known of the Hebrew prophetess, Deborah, who judged Israel and 'dwelt under the palm tree of Deborah' (Judges 4. 5)." To the present writer it does not seem impossible at all, especially as the parallelism extends

¹ This understanding of *eminus* was suggested by Professor Knapp.

² See other references in Rohde *Psyche*, p. 167. I am under obligations to Professor David M. Robinson for calling my attention to the tale.

beyond the one phrase. The two lines which we have quoted read like a paraphrase of the Hebrew narrative—"And Deborah a prophetess (*fida internuntia caeli*), the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel (*interpres legum Solymarum*) at that time. And she dwelt under the palm tree of Deborah." The satirist ironically identifies the palsied old fortune-teller with one of the heroines of Jewish legend.

Much as Juvenal disliked the orientals, it is quite obvious that they and their superstitions interested him profoundly. There is nothing strange in an allusion to Jewish legend in a poet who devotes a whole satire to the practices of certain obscure Egyptian fanatics. If, as some have held, the poet visited Egypt, he may have got his knowledge from the Jews of Alexandria. Such an assumption, however, is unnecessary. Given the interest in such matters, he could easily have satisfied it without leaving Rome.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

BARNARD COLLEGE.

VI.—THE ENDINGS *-ERE* AND *-ERUNT* IN DACTYLIC HEXAMETER.

Both endings of the third person plural of the perfect indicative *-ere* and *-erunt* are used in the hexameter, but are not of equal value in the composition of the verse. The greater frequency of *-ere* indicates a desire to increase the number of dactyls, especially in the fifth foot. In prose, personal preferences are in many instances clearly marked. Wölfflin, Archiv 14, 478, cites for the prose of Petronius 13 occurrences of *-ere* while *-erunt* is used 86 times. This is in marked contrast with the poetry where *-ere* is freely used,¹ while *-erunt* is found

127, 5 albaque de viridi riserunt lilia prato;
and 128, 7 mox ubi fugerunt elusam gaudia mentem.

Verbs with these endings generally have the poetical accent on the penult, although those beginning lines are exceptions as are some occurrences elsewhere:

Lucr. 2, 73 unde abeunt minuunt, quo venere augmine
donant;

6, 402 an simul ac nubes successere, ipse in eas tum;

6, 508 multa modis multis convenere undique ad-
aucta.

Sil. Ital. 15, 352 haec ubi sedere, ardentis attollere sese;

16, 42 imperfecta. Supercontexere herbida lapsos/
pondera.

The ending *-ere* occurs most frequently in the fifth foot, somewhat less frequently in the second and third, and occasionally in the fourth and sixth. The *e* is in the arsis of the first in the case

¹ *Cecidere* 109; *emicuere* 127; *fregere* 119, 22 and 123, 187; *incaluere* 123, 189; *intremuere* 124, 271; *maduere* 136; *meruere* 108; *quaesivere* 124, 265; *sonuere* 122, 180; *stupuere* 123, 191; *surripuere* 119, 21; see also Frag. XXVIII.* 9 *invenere*.

of a few trisyllables, and always with elision of the final *e*.¹ In the sixth foot only trisyllabic verbs with short antepenults are admitted, excepting by Lucretius and Catullus. Latin had a very limited supply of such verbs, and after the time of Lucretius only three such words² are used in the hexameter. When the *e* gives the thesis for the second foot, the verb is usually of four or five syllables, though a trisyllable with long antepenult and preceded by a monosyllable gives a spondee at the beginning of the line, as in

Verg. A. 6, 163 Ut venere, vident indigna morte peremptum ;
Ovid Met. 3, 574 hunc dixere tamen comitem famulumque
sacrorum ;

Stat. Theb. 1, 645 Has egere vias. Ego sum, qui caede subegi.

Sometimes the verb is quadrisyllabic and a dactyl is formed, as in

Verg. A. 1, 130 nec latuere doli fratrem Iunonis et irae.

The trisyllable is rarely preceded by a dissyllable: Verg. G. 2, 501 sponte tulere ; A. 11, 186 more tulere ; Ovid Met. 12, 154 sacra tulere ; Sil. Ital. 9, 410 arma fuere ; 13, 656 ulla fuere ; Lucr. 4, 854 [nata dedere].

In the fourth foot the final *e* is elided in about 40% of the occurrences, though there is generally elision in Lucretius and Vergil, and in a majority of the instances in Statius. When the vowel is not elided it is followed in about three-fourths of the passages by *c*, *p* or *s*. Vergil has only *c*: G. 1, 183 fodere cubilia ; A. 4, 346 iussere capessere ; A. 6, 274 posuere cubilia.

¹ *Coepere* Lucr. 5, 287 ; Verg. B. 7, 19 ; Ovid Met. 8, 760 ; Sil. Ital. 7, 355 ; *Fecere*: Verg. G. 4, 272 ; Ovid Met. 14, 638 ; *Odere* Verg. A. 4, 321 ; *Videre*: Verg. A. 12, 447 ; Ovid Met. 11, 305 ; Val. Flac. 8, 325 ; and from Silius Italicus *duxere* 16, 551 ; *iussere* 7, 390 ; 14, 274 ; *sensere* 9, 453 ; *venere* 3, 265.

² *Dedere*: Lucr. 1, 737 ; 5, 1110 ; 5, 1340 ; Verg. G. 1, 287 ; 3, 83 ; 3, 115 ; 3, 247 ; 3, 378 ; 4, 204 ; A. 1, 398 ; 2, 243 ; 2, 566 ; 3, 238 ; 3, 337 ; 3, 566 ; 9, 292 ; 9, 686 ; 10, 488 ; 11, 190 ; 12, 696 ; Ovid Met. 2, 675 ; 3, 207 ; 3, 315 ; 4, 79 ; 7, 495 ; 15, 617 ; Claudian XV. 52 ; XXIV. 104 ; XXX. 37. *Fuere* Lucr. 1, 234 ; 2, 298 ; 4, 1019 ; 5, 325 ; Verg. A. 8, 324 ; Ovid. Met. 8, 711 ; 10, 75 ; Lucan 10, 498. Claudian VIII. 334 ; XX. 242 ; XXIV. 202 ; XXVIII. 103. *Tulere* Verg. A. 2, 131 ; 5, 582 ; 11, 800 ; Claudian VIII. 310 ; XXVI. 391 ; XXXV. 260. *Dissiluere* Lucr. 1, 391 ; *interiere* 3, 937 ; *procubuerunt* 1, 291 ; *exiluere* Catullus 62, 8.

Statius has *c* and *s*, while Claudian has *c*, *p* and *s*, one occurrence with *v* XXVIII. 346 *fluxere vaporibus*, and one instance of elision XXVI. 107

semper ab his famae petiere insignia bellis.

Verbs ending in *-erunt* generally have the metrical accent on the penult, though this is sometimes an irrational short, and sometimes it ends the foot, as in

Lucr. 4, 531 *ire foras ubi coeperunt primordia vocum* ;
Val. Flac. 4, 374 *flevit Amydone flerunt Messeides undae*.

The ending *-erunt* is excluded from the fifth foot, and occurs but rarely in the third. Most of the writers examined do not admit it at all at this point. It occurs freely in the last foot while more than half the occurrences are in the fourth, giving a spondee at that point, though there may be a dactyl as in Stat. Theb. 11, 673 *horruit instinctu rabido steteruntque trementes*. Other occurrences of short *e* in the penult are not uncommon, especially in the earlier writers and chiefly when the verb is four or five syllables long. Such penults are found chiefly in the first¹ and second² feet. When the shortened penult is in the third³ foot the verb is generally trisyllabic. In the sixth foot⁴ *-erunt* occurs

¹ *Abstulerunt* Ovid Met. 6, 617; *constiterunt* Lucr. 5, 415; Verg. A. 3, 681; *deciderunt* Lucr. 5, 193; *dididerunt* Lucr. 6, 2; *defuerunt* Ovid Met. 6, 585; Sil. Ital. 14, 207; *desierunt* Lucr. 4, 402; *exciderunt* Stat. Theb. 3, 302; *excierunt* Lucr. 4, 37; *inciderunt* Lucr. 6, 1174; *occiderunt* 3, 1028; *pertulerunt* Sil. Ital. 10, 61; *polluerunt* Val. Flac. 4, 457; *prodiderunt* Lucr. 3, 87; *profuerunt* Sil. Ital. 5, 264; *transtulerunt* Lucr. 3, 134; and if not pronounced as a trisyllable *miscuerunt* Verg. G. 2, 129; 3, 283; Sil. Ital. 14, 45.

² *Absciderunt* Stat. Theb. 5, 274; *adnuerunt* Hor. Sat. 1, 10, 45; Sil. Ital. 16, 700; *dederunt* Lucr. 4, 974; 6, 4; *destiterunt* Lucr. 4, 975; *exciderunt* Stat. Theb. 7, 801; *exierunt* Lucr. 6, 120; *fuerunt* Lucr. 5, 474; 5, 677; *institerunt* Lucr. 1, 406; *steterunt* Verg. A. 2, 774; 3, 48; Lucan 4, 771; Stat. Theb. 10, 688; Sil. Ital. 14, 519.

³ *Dederunt* Hor. Ep. 1, 4, 7; *fuerunt* Lucr. 5, 878; *inciderunt* Lucr. 6, 351; *steterunt* Verg. 10, 334; *tulerunt* Verg. B. 4, 61.

⁴ *Dederunt* Ovid Met. 9, 756; 12, 334; Stat. Silv. 4, 1, 45; Sil. Ital. 5, 201; 11, 364; 16, 701. *Fuerunt* Lucr. 1, 467; 4, 1251; 5, 1283; Hor. Sat. 1, 5, 43; Ovid Met. 1, 121; 2, 333; 2, 666; 4, 396; 6, 716; 9, 586; 13, 151; 15, 18; 15, 110; Juv. 8, 254. *Tulerunt* Verg. B. 5, 34; G. 2, 422; 2, 454; A. 1, 605; Hor. Ep. 2, 1, 246; Ovid Met. 7, 501; 11, 661; Lucan 3, 646; 4, 818; 7, 314; Sil. Ital. 9, 590; 11, 523. *Quierunt* Verg. A. 6, 102; 6, 328; 7, 6; 11, 300;

rather more freely than *-ere*, and a larger number of different verbs are used.

	I.		II.		III.		IV.		V.	VI.				Total
	-re	-runt	-re	-runt	-re	-runt	-re	-runt	-re	-re	-runt	-re	-runt	
Lucretius..	1	18	18	16	14	8	7	18	87	10	18	82	68	150
Verg. B....	1	1	1	1	5	10	2	12	9	21
" G....	1	3	12	1	14	2	7	84	6	2	69	18	82
" A....	2	2	81	2	64	1	12	18	57	15	6	281	29	260
Lucan.....	9	97	5	137	17	57	100	1	5	852	76	428
Val. Flac ..	1	1	28	55	1	8	21	44	1	126	24	150
Stat. Silv	1	23	18	4	14	28	4	78	19	92
" Theb.	6	87	8	66	15	37	104	2	272	48	320
Sil. Ital.....	9	29	86	10	88	25	47	98	10	12	811	98	409
Ovid. Met..	3	18	97	23	63	16	29	118	9	19	806	89	395
Hor. Ep....	8	7	9	1	2	14	1	30	7	37
" Sat....	2	2	6	8	2	7	1	17	11	28
Persius.....	1	2	1	1	3	4	8	4	12
Juvenal	7	4	3	1	1	10	7	1	18	21	34
Claudian	6	59	3	91	11	32	110	10	281	41	322
	18	101	593	73	630	7	114	302	767	61	74	2183	557	2740

The table shows the number of occurrences noticed for the different writers examined, and though not including all that might be included, it indicates sufficiently clearly the general attitude toward the two endings, as well as some of the individual preferences. The shorter ending occurs about four times as

Stat. Theb. 6, 798; Val. Flac. 2, 404; Sil. Ital. 7, 253. *Locarunt* Lucr. 1, 1022; 5, 420; Lucan 6, 413. *Negarunt* Lucan 8, 863; Ovid Met. 3, 574; 13, 131; Sil. Ital. 4, 367; 16, 549. *Probarunt* Ovid Met. 8, 616; Stat. Silv. 5, 1, 69. *Putarunt* Lucr. 1, 635; 1, 705; 1, 708. *Norunt* Stat. Theb. 7, 169; Sil. Ital. 2, 485; 14, 141 (?). *Biberunt* Verg. B. 3, 111. *Flerunt* Stat. Silv. 2, 1, 175. *Impleverunt* Ovid Met. 7, 114. With the exception of *minuerunt* Lucr. 5, 415; *voluerunt* 5, 1347; and perhaps *venerunt* 1, 1077 (see Lachmann ad loc.), other scattering examples end in *-arunt* or *-orunt*. Lucretius has *crearunt* 2, 1155; *imperitarunt* 3, 1028; *nominitarunt* 6, 424; *notarunt* 5, 695; *pararunt* 5, 1011; *rogarunt* 6, 3; Ovid Met. *exhalarunt* 6, 247; *vacarunt* 10, 43; Verg. A. 10, 419 *sacrarunt*; Sil. Ital. *amarunt* 14, 466; *remorunt* 11, 176; and perhaps *morunt* 14, 141.

frequently as the longer, and Lucretius distributes them the most evenly through the verse. He also shortens the penult in *-erunt* the most freely, and with Ovid and Silius Italicus has the largest proportion at the beginning as well as at the end of lines. Claudian has only *-ere* at the end and Vergil prefers it. The satirists, excepting Persius, take a more immediate view than do the epic writers of the events described and have less occasion to use the perfect. There is a difference between the Satires and Epistles in the distribution of the two endings in the second foot, and at this point Lucan also differs from some of the other writers who use the endings about the same number of times.

R. B. STEELE.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENN.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Syntax of Early Latin. Vol. I—The Verb. By CHARLES E. BENNETT. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, 1910. Pp. xix + 506. \$4.00.

Professor Bennett has discharged a huge task in a manner highly to his own credit and that of American scholarship and has earned the thanks of all students of Latin for the rich array of facts presented, for the criticism to which he has so often subjected the facts and the views of others concerning them, and for the numerous bibliographical hints, even though the latter make no claim to be exhaustive. We are a long step nearer to a real *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*.

The author's purpose was "to prepare a work to replace the now antiquated Holtze, *Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum*", published in 1861, 1862. For practical purposes he has chosen 100 B. C. as the lower limit of Early Latin; he holds that, had he extended his work to 75 B. C., only a few citations from the Sullan annalists and from inscriptions would have been added to the material actually used. He forgets the Auctor ad Herennium and Cicero's earliest orations; Lucretius too and Varro might well at times have come within his ken; the former certainly belonged in spirit to an earlier age. On the other hand should the 'Plautine' prologues have been unhesitatingly admitted? Within the limits set he sought to consider all existing remains of any syntactical significance; he has often been obliged to supplement existing monographs, etc., by collections of his own. I fear, however, that his collections are not always as exhaustive as he thinks them to be. Thus, a reference to Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus*, 4-5, will show that the list of examples of A cum B in the subject with a plural verb (page 3) is not complete; Lindsay again, 4-6, gives phenomena of concord not noted by Professor Bennett. But completeness is not to be expected in a first edition of a book so varied in contents.

According to the Preface, the fragments of the dramatists are quoted from Ribbeck, "other poetic fragments" from Baehrens. What of Vahlen's *Ennius* (1903) and Marx's *Lucilius* (1904)? The failure to use the best editions is the more unfortunate because the author seldom takes account of variant readings. I wish also that he had printed somewhere a complete list of all the books, monographs, articles, etc., cited by him, with indication of the title or abbreviation by which he intended to refer to each, and that he had used such title or abbreviation consistently.

At present it requires much labor to determine whether a given book or article has been used. Dates of publication are not always given; when given, they are not always right. The addition in all cases of dates and places of publication would have helped in many ways. The Index (489-506) covers over 34 columns, but comes far short of revealing the riches of the book. Thus, for parataxis add references to 120, 166; for potential subjunctive add 63, 147, 159, 180.

The book falls into nine chapters, as follows: I. Agreement, Voices, Impersonal Verbs, Omission of Verb (1-9); II. Tenses of the Indicative [Especially in Principal Clauses] (10-59); III. The Indicative in Subordinate Clauses (60-144); IV. The Subjunctive in Principal Clauses (145-207); V. The Subjunctive in Subordinate Clauses (208-347); VI. The Imperative (348-365); VII. The Infinitive (366-428); VIII. Participles, Gerund, and Supine, etc. (429-459); IX. The Sentence-Question (460-488).

A reviewer of a book so full of varied riches is necessarily an eclectic. To make a summary of its views is, usually, neither desirable nor necessary; it is primarily a reference book and the student must come to know it at first hand by long continued use. Perforce, then, an eclectic, I have chosen to make for this review a careful study of the first 207 pages (Chapters I-IV; much of Chapter V is conditioned by the views set forth in earlier pages, and the later chapters are at once less intricate and less interesting); further, at the risk of seeming unappreciative of the vast store of good things which the book contains, I have chosen to set down here chiefly the things in which I cannot follow Professor Bennett's guidance. In this way I may, perchance, contribute a little to the study of Early Latin syntax.

It is clear that, to reach the divisions represented by his chapter-headings, the author classified by form (on such classification see Professor Goodell, *A School Grammar of Attic Greek*, viii-x, and Professor Morris's review of Lane's *Latin Grammar*, A. J. P. XX 326). Nowhere, however, does he explain or even indicate his system. Within the chapters the classification is now by form, now by function. Thus, in Chapter III the main divisions are Conditional Sentences, Temporal Clauses . . . Indirect Questions, Causal Clauses . . . Clauses introduced by Local Particles. Subordinate rubrics are Protasis in Present Indicative . . . Substantive *si*-clauses, "Concessive" *si*-clauses . . . *quom-inversum*, etc.

In Chapter IV the main subdivisions are Volitive Uses, Optative Uses, Potential Uses. Under Volitive Uses, the examples of the Jussive Subjunctive fall into two groups, one giving examples in which no introductory particle is present, the other those in which such particle appears.

In the first chapter, in treating concord of verb with two or more subjects, the author seems not to make enough allowance

for word-order, and, at times, for logic. Thus, in Aul. 217 *tu me et ego te qualis sis scio*, though the two subjects precede the verb, the clause *qualis sis* makes the singular *scio* inevitable. So, in § 3, p. 2, it is important to note under (b) that, in three of the four cases in which the verb is said to be attracted to the number of the predicate, the singular predicate intervenes between the plural subject and the singular verb. In the fourth case, Enn. Epicharm. 507, given as *Iupiter sunt ista quae dico tibi*, Baehrens in fact read *Istic est is Iupiter quem dico* without hint of MS variation; so also Vahlen, Ennius³, p. 222, and Spengel, Varro L. L. 5, 65. The list of examples of the "Absolute Use" of transitive verbs (4-5) I should often question. The needed object is frequently in the context. One who reads in the large will note, e. g., in connection with Rud. 178, *ad saxum quo capessit*, that at Rud. 172 we had *horsum se capessit*; the *se* needed in 178 is still before mind, or eye, or ear. Yet Mr. Bennett, unconscious of this, cites 178 before 172, as he cites Cis. 92 *insinuavit* before Cis. 89 *insinuavit se*. In Am. 243 *equites* is object, not subject, of *inducere*. So, on pages 6-7, in the list of passive verbs used as reflexives, there is much room for differences of opinion. But the infinitives in Poen. 219 ff. are surely passive; read 210-216 and 223-229, especially 229. On page 9 the omission of the verb is said to be frequent, but only examples of omitted parts of *sum* are given, and these cannot be exhaustive. See e. g., Brix-Niemeyer *Trinummus*⁴, on 705, 811, Spengel and Fairclough on And. 120, Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus*, 55, 7.

Though Chapter II professes to deal with the tenses of the indicative, "especially in principal clauses", neither here nor elsewhere do the tenses in subordinate clauses receive serious attention. It had been better if this chapter had begun with a general discussion of tense, something comparable to the discussion of the force of the subjunctive, in the first pages of Chapter IV. To our author the present is largely achronistic. This may be, but Most. 949, 950, cited as sure proof, are feeble support; cf. *habitat* there (bis) with *habitavit*, 951, and remember that since 450 the (supposed) contrast between the present and the past of this house has been repeatedly emphasized. No account is taken (11-17) of Lane's distinction between the Present of Vivid Narration and the Annalistic Present, so highly praised by Professor Morgan. The view that the historical present is achronistic, and only "narrates the bare fact of an action which took place in a sphere of time determined as past by the context" (13) seems inconsistent with the (better) view, quoted with approval on page 12, that in using this tense the speaker views occurrences "as if they were going on before his eyes in the sphere of his own present". Again, if the historical present is achronistic, how can it give the effect of greater vividness than the perfect (17)? In discussing passages showing historical

present and perfect together Professor Bennett takes no account of metrical considerations (but on page 57 he employs such considerations); to me they seem important. In 18 ff. many of the examples cited to show that the present has future value seem inappropriate. Thus, in the examples with *abeo* (19), may we not suppose that the speaker, as he uttered the word, was already in motion? Note Professor Bennett's own suggestions at 19. c, d, 20. 4. The treatment of *etiam* in certain questions which to our author have imperative force (25) is poor; so too is the discussion of *etiam* on pages 480-481. Professor Kirk's paper, *Etiam in Plautus and Terence*, A. J. P. XVIII 26-42, is far better; see also my paper, *Notes on Etiam in Plautus*, Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc. 41.

From the progressive use of the imperfect Professor Bennett derives the customary and iterative uses (26); why then must the customary use of the present come from the aoristic use of the present (11)? In Epid. 99 *antehac . . . solebas dare*, he makes *solebas* aoristic; "it is illogical to speak of a custom being customary" (31). But on page 157 he declares that the phenomena of language are not logical, but psychological and sociological. Aside from that, the important word here is not *solebas*, but *dare* colored by *solebas*; the speaker is seeking to bring out customariness better than could be done by *dabas. eram, eras*, etc., our author makes usually aoristic, not customary imperfect, because he can see no notion of continued *action* (34; the italics are mine) here; but why not see continued *state* or *condition*? (cf. 29-30). In As. 927, modo, quom dicta in me ingerebas, odium, non uxor, eram, cited as sure proof that *eram* is aoristic, because "the idea corresponding to a 'wasn't being' seems very inappropriate", both clauses are progressive, and the second clause is not really negative; the sense is *odium potius quam uxor eram*. My remarks in The Classical Weekly 2. 185, 3. 49 on the right interpretation of *non* in supposed cases of *ut non = ne* in final clauses will be found to apply here.

In the examples of the volitive future indicative in commands (39. c), I see a "familiar imperative" (Gildersleeve, A. J. P. XVIII 121) and, commonly, a peremptory tone (not so Professor Bennett). To me this future expresses, properly, a prediction; since no one can predict another's conduct unless he controls that other, we readily get the tone commonly present in this use. To Professor Bennett *ita me amabit Iuppiter* is optative, and there is no difference between this phrase and *ita me Iuppiter amet*; to me the former is prediction (predicted blessing), the latter a prayer. I agree then with Sjögren. In Pers. 16, To. di ament te. SAG. O Toxile, dabunt di quae exoptes, regarded by Professor Bennett as decisive for his view, the shift from subjunctive to indicative may well be due to the second speaker's desire to cap the word of the first (predicted blessings are, at least linguistically, better than blessings prayed for). Note the

emotional O Toxile, and cf. the fine courtesy of Plesidippus's words, interpreted by my explanation, in Rud. 107 DAE. Virile sexus numquam ullum habui. PL. At di dabunt ('that will come by the gods' good grace').

The perfect is said to = a future, e. g., in M. G. disperiistis, nisi mulcassitis, Am. 428 victus sum si dixeris (46). Why, then, are *perii*, *occidi*, etc., described (45) as examples of the present perfect denoting "the continued state resulting from a completed act". Strange language this! At the least it should run "from an act completed in fact or in imagination". Does Hannibal's *vicimus* in Livy 21. 43. 2 refer to the future? To the category, rightly explained, belong examples not noted by our author; e. g., Men. 225 *cocta sunt* (contrast 326); M. G. 185 *dixi* (read in the light of 182-184). Instructive in another tense-sphere are Ps. 892 *quin tu is accubitus . . . corrumpitur iam cena*, and Rud. 304 *nisi quid . . . capsimus, incenati sumus (= cenavimus)*.

The statement (46) that in *potuit* + the infinitive we have "the use of the perfect indicative as the equivalent of the pluperfect subjunctive" seems most unfortunate; *potuit reperire* and *potuisset reperire* are different things. On page 36, writing about the 'shifted imperfect' the author speaks more wisely. On page 52, again (under *satis fuerat*, etc.) he is also more careful.

If the pluperfect did not originally represent an act (state) as prior to another past act (state), and if this is the most frequent use of the tense in Early Latin (47; 50), division 1 (48) and division 3 (50) should change places. In Plautus and Terence, however, to one who reads in the large the pluperfect often, I think, has the force commonly assigned to the tense. In 53. 6, since *sisto* is properly a transitive verb (*ἵστημι* rather than *sto*), the pluperfect does not in Ps. 913a, *ubi restiteras*, and Catulus, Baehrens, p. 276, *Constiteram . . . salutans*, denote the state resulting from a completed past act.

In Chapter III conditional sentences are first considered. The earliest conditional period, it is said, consisted simply of two paratactic indicatives (to the few examples of this we may, perhaps, add Heaut. 78-79, taking *rectumst* and *non est* as 'protases', and punctuating with a question mark, as we can in some of our author's examples). But parataxis has not yet been defined, nor is it here defined; neither here nor at 208-209 is this all-important subject adequately treated, at least for ordinary mortals.

Conditional sentences are classified at first by the tense of the protasis; within the groups thus fixed the sub-divisions are determined by the form of the apodosis. There is no comment on the value of the protasis, and no names are used. This is, in effect, the system introduced by Lane's Latin Grammar and so heartily approved by Professor Morris, A. J. P. XX 327-328.

On page 73 the author sees "pronounced temporal force" in *si*, in Hec. 181 *si quando ad eam accesserat, fugere*, and Cato,

Frag. Jord. 35. 3 si quis strenue fecerat, donabam. But in Terence the temporal force is due to *quando*; in Cato there is no temporal force, unless there is temporal force in *quicumque* in such a clause as *quicumque strenue fecerat*. An excellent paragraph is c, p. 77, giving examples in which one protasis is qualified, <restated, or amplified> by another; add, perhaps, Phorm. 13-15.

On pages 77-78 substantive *si*-clauses appear. But I doubt the propriety of saying that in Mil. 1326, nil miror si lubenter hie eras, the *si*-clause is substantive, or of saying that in Cato, Frag. Jord. 25. 5 idne irascimini si quis superbior est quam vos? the *si*-clause is appositive to *id*. In Phorm. 1040 f. the effect is surely far better if we take the *si*-clause as truly conditional (adverbial). Is *nil miror si haec fecisti* exactly the same as *nil miror te haec fecisse*? Further, I regard as most unfortunate the growing tendency (seen often in this book) to describe as substantival all sorts of clauses that are properly adverbial. See Professor Morris's good words, A. J. P. XX 326, concerning Lane's treatment of certain final and consecutive clauses (though he seems to have overlooked Lane 1948). This tendency is no aid to the right understanding of Latin syntax; rather does it sorely befog students.

In the account of temporal *quom*-clauses (79 ff.) I miss a reference to Professor Hale's elaborate study of *cum*. If Poen. 924 nunc est *quom me commoror* is rightly classed (79) as an example of the descriptive *quom*-clause, I should put here Cap. 516 nunc illud est *quom . . . nimio* mavelim, a passage I used (see The Classical Review 14 [1900]. 216) in an attempt to explain *nunc quom maxime*, seen in Terence (see Spengel on And. 823) and in Cicero C. M. 38; cf. Plautus's *nimio* with the *maxime* of the idiom. On page 86 it is stated, to my mind wrongly, that *quom magis* = *quo magis*, e. g., in Pers. 564 *quom magis contemplo, magis placet*. If *quom* is ever temporal, it is temporal here. See also Professor Fay on Most. 702. On page 85 one of four examples of "Substantive *quom*-clauses" is Cas. 39 *abhinc annos factum est XVI quom conspicatust . . . puellam exponi*. Substitute here *Anni XVI sunt quom*, etc., and this example is exactly like that in the next paragraph, which illustrates *quom*, 'since' ('seitdem').

On page 98, Professor Bennett interprets Bacch. 737 *Mane dum scribit* as 'wait till he writes', not as 'wait while he is writing'. The view in Hale-Buck 571 is not noted. To me *dum* in these passages means 'while' (cf. Gildersleeve-Lodge 571, 228, page 157). In his Lexicon Plautinum, s. v. *Dum* 3, page 440, Professor Lodge interprets by "*ἐν φ, sed vergit ad significationem 'donec'*".—Hanc autem rem quisnam diiudicabit?

Professor Bennett finds (101) only two examples of *postquam* with imperfect indicative (Schmalz⁴, page 550, finds only one, Most. 640). One, Most. 647 (640), Professors Sonnenschein and Fay leave without comment in their editions. But Phorm. 569,

postquam videt me eius mater esse hic diutius, simul autem non manebat aetas virginis meam neglegentiam, . . . ad me profectam esse aibant, though taken by others as it is by our author, is not germane; at the least it is not a clear case, for the *simul autem* clause may surely be regarded as parenthetical, grammatically, and may be set off by dashes. In Most. 647 may we see the use of *postquam* with imperfect which became so common later in Livy? see Gildersleeve-Lodge 562. *Postquam* with pluperfect indicative is not common (102); it may be added that the restriction that marks this use later (G.-L. 563. 2) does not appear in Professor Bennett's examples.

In the discussion of clauses introduced by *antequam* and *priusquam* more use might have been made of Professor Hullihen's treatise on these conjunctions (to which a mere blanket reference is made at 104, note), especially on page 106, in connection with the remark that in 16 out of 18 examples of *priusquam* with the future perfect indicative the main clause is negative. So far as I know, to Professor Hullihen belongs the credit of having first observed the important part which the presence of the negative in the main clause plays in the *antequam* and *priusquam* constructions. For a convenient summary of his views see The Classical Weekly 4. 194-196, 203-205.

The indicative in indirect questions (viewed as the original use, arising out of parataxis: 120) is well discussed. In Cap. 206a, however, *scimus nos nostrum officium quod est* (listed with questions introduced by *quis*), our author overlooks *quod*; we have here no question but a relative clause and grammatical prolepsis. In this list Professor Bennett does not note how often the indicative in 'indirect' questions occurs in connection with an imperative (he notes this later, in other groups); it is, of course, precisely here that one could hesitate longest in (English as in) Latin between independent and dependent questions (and ejaculations).

The lists on pages 123-132 show well how much more frequent *quia* is than *quod* in causal clauses in Early Latin. But I find here no discussion of the difference (or lack of difference) of meaning, or of the classes of verbs used in the main clause (comment of this kind does occur in the discussion of *quom-causal* clauses, 133, bottom). The reader must determine for himself whether the examples bear out what is commonly said on these points (at least for later times).

On page 131 examples of *nisi quia* are given. It is then said that *nisi* alone sometimes = *nisi quia*, e. g., in Cist. 676 *ubi ea sit nescio, nisi . . . loca haec circiter mi excidit*, Rud. 750 *nescio, nisi scio probiorem hanc esse quam te*. This explanation is better than that often given, that *nisi* here is adversative,¹ but I

¹ So even Schmalz⁴, p. 589, citing Lindskog. Schmalz talks also as if the construction were commoner than Professor Bennett's examples indicate; he says, too, it is commoner in Terence than in Plautus; our author's examples give the opposite result.

do not think it right. There is to me no ellipsis here of *quia* and no adversative force. Nearly all the examples show *nescio nisi*. I once heard a Vermont farmer beg his son to use care in getting some pigs back into their pen; in true Plautine-Terentian fashion he cried, "You can't drive them unless you can coax them". He meant, "You can't do anything with them unless you can coax them". In a word he had in mind as his main verb rather a universal negation such as *nescio* in our Latin examples. This explanation, which I worked out independently years ago, I find now in Lindskog ap. Schmalz⁴, p. 589.

Chapter IV begins with an excellent discussion (146-161) of the force(s) of the Latin subjunctive. The history of opinion concerning the fundamental values of the Indo-European subjunctive and optative and the basic values of the Latin subjunctive is given briefly but well. The author agrees with Delbrück (154), that the Indo-European subjunctive expressed volition and futurity, the Indo-European optative wish and potentiality. He notes (155) that Delbrück, in saying this, is not concerned with the "question of the absolutely original values of the subjunctive and optative". The relationship of the functions of the two moods—a very different matter, says the author—is now considered. Here again he agrees with Delbrück, but hesitatingly; he regards this question as far less important than the question "as to the existence of the uses themselves and as to their Indo-European character" (161). On the unimportance of "Indo-European character" as an *explanation* of phenomena see Professor Morris, A. J. P. XVIII 401. He sums up thus (160-161): "I agree with Delbrück in his recognition of fundamental uses; volitive and future for the Indo-European subjunctive; wishing and potential for the Indo-European optative. These potential uses are the 'may' and 'should'-'would' potentials. To them jointly I have elsewhere given the name of 'contingent futurity', a designation which I shall employ also in my subsequent discussion of the potential uses of the Latin subjunctive. The Deliberative I regard with Brugmann as also Indo-European, but I consider it a volitive development and shall treat it as such". The system of the present book, then, is essentially that of the author's Latin Grammar (with Appendix), published in 1894.

Surely such terms as 'may' potential, 'should'-'would' potential cannot be regarded as happy. When a Roman wished to say 'can', 'could', in any sense in which these words are naturally understood by English-speaking persons, he used the right form of *possum*. Even Professor Bennett's caution (206), that he uses 'could' in the sense of German *konnte*, in *Man konnte sehen*, will not protect all of his readers. An even worse use of 'can', it seems to me, occurs on page 178, in the elaborate discussion of the deliberative subjunctive; there Eun. 822 quid tibi ego dicam misera? is rendered by 'dear me! what can I say!' and is explained as "implying that the speaker is in a condition

where the proposed action is hopelessly impossible".¹ This seems a case of wrong translation, followed by a category due to the laying of too much stress on the translation. By a similar process Professor Hale easily discovered An Unrecognized Construction of the Latin Subjunctive; The Second Person Singular in Statements of Fact (see *Classical Philology* 1. 21 ff.). If the term potential is to be retained, it would be better to retain it only in connection with such an absolutely impeccable statement as Professor Bennett himself gives, on page 197, under the caption "The 'Should'-'Would' Potential". I would he had written only that on the subject.

The classification and discussion of independent uses of the subjunctive begins with the consideration of volitive uses (161-191). The jussive subjunctive has the right of way (162-166). In *ut* as used with the jussive subjunctive Professor Bennett sees an indefinite *ut*, corresponding to the indefinite use of the adverb *qui* (165-166). The jussive subjunctive in perfect tense is rare; there is no difference, he thinks, between the present jussive and the perfect jussive in force. Thus early the author has in mind Professor Elmer's views concerning the Latin Prohibitive. The affirmative hortatory subjunctive is common, the negative is not (of the latter only four examples are given, 167). Here Plautus has *ne*, Scipio *non*, Ennius *nec . . . non*. On page 167 we read: "While *ne* (*neve*) were volitive negatives, yet *non* and *neque* were always possible at every period of the language". Again, we read (168), that in prohibitions, in both present and perfect subjunctive, *non*, *nullus*, *nemo*, *numquam* occur (see 170, 171); from 172-173 it appears that *neque* (*nec*) occurs 26 times as connective in prohibitions, *neve* (*neu*) only 10 times. "Barring Poen. 29, *neve* is used only when the preceding clause is prohibitive, and even then *neque* may be used (Seyffert, Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, 63, p. 37)". These facts are brought together on page 173 to disprove Professor Elmer's argument, A. J. P. XV 299 ff., that *ne* is the only possible negative with the prohibitive subjunctive, and that the forms with *non*, etc., show rather subjunctives of obligation or propriety developed out of the potential subjunctive. The possibility of such potential origin, says our author, was not made clear by Professor Elmer; surely it is as clear as the development of *ἰσθούης ἄν* into a quasi-command recognized by so good an authority as Jebb, on Antig. 444. The frequency of *non* with prohibitions in Early Latin throws interesting light on the frequency of this use in Silver Latin. But I think Professor Bennett's treatment of *neque* and *neve* in these connections inadequate; see my note in *The Classical Weekly* 2. 169, and Lease, *Classical Philology* 3. 302 ff.

Professor Bennett agrees with Professor Elmer that Madvig's distinction between the second singular present subjunctive and

¹ Professor Bennett overlooks, I fear, *tibi*; he overlooks also the triple appeal in 817-821 to Pythias for speech; he overlooks, finally, the fact that the important word here is *quid*: 'What would you have me say?'

the second singular perfect subjunctive in prohibitions (set forth in all American grammars, I think, till the appearance of Professor Elmer's papers in 1894, set forth in none published or revised since that year) will not hold. But he refuses to believe, with Professor Elmer, that the perfect is used where there is special emotion; this view, he thinks, is subjective, and has met with little favor and much criticism. True to his conception of the present tense as largely aoristic, he thinks (against Delbrück) that the present prohibitive is often aoristic and that it does not represent the act as in process.

The discussion of that difficult theme, the deliberative subjunctive (178-186), is not as clear and satisfactory as it might be. His caption is (p. 178), The "Deliberative" Subjunctive. He differentiates four types, which are "seldom differentiated" but "usually . . . all brought roughly under the one head of the 'Deliberative'". These are: (a) Subjunctive of Inquiry after a Command or Advice; (b) Subjunctive of Duty or Fitness; (c) True Deliberatives; (d) Subjunctive of Impossibility or Helplessness. The juxtaposition here of "Deliberative" and "True Deliberative" will not help younger (or older) students. Nor will the confusion be relieved when one reads (179) that the Subjunctive of Inquiry after Command or Advice "seems to be the original type of the four categories above mentioned". Why then is it not True Deliberative? Further, I regard the division into four classes as of less consequence than the observation that these four types, "seldom differentiated", are indeed held together by a common bond, in the fact that the speaker is always inquiring after a command or after advice; he always throws himself on some one else, whether that other is actually present in the flesh or no more ready and competent to help *praesens* than are the earth and sea and sky, to which, in Greek tragedy, appeal is made on similar occasions. To me the examples under (a) and (b) lie too close together to be separated; in all of them the speaker recognizes, in greater or less degree, "the superior authority, wisdom or judgment of the person addressed"; in both sets of examples we often have a preceding imperative, uttered by another speaker. The term True Deliberative Professor Bennett restricts (184) to examples in which "the speaker is represented as actually deliberating with himself as to what course of action he shall pursue". The distinction I made above holds here; the speaker is appealing to a helper or adviser not present in the flesh or, if you will, to himself, in soliloquy, as Professor Morris holds. For self conceived of as another self compare such phrases as *mihi conscius sum*, ἐμὲ αὐτῷ συννοῖδα. This type is manifestly a later and sophisticated type; hence we have another argument against giving the title true deliberative to this rather than to type (a). Concerning the Subjunctive of Helplessness I have said a word above; it stands to type (c) much as the 'Ethical Dative' stands to the 'Dative of Reference'.

The suggestion made (e. g. by Delbrück, Elmer) that some of the questions under (b) are potential our author rejects (180). But he regards As. 724 "*quid exoptem?*" as one of the few cases in Early Latin where a potential character could be easily defended". Why should not account be taken of the possibility that the subjunctive in these questions, following as they do an imperative giving another's utterances, is due to Oratio Obliqua? This oratio obliqua possibility is not considered in the discussion of the Repudiating Question (186 ff.), which is to Professor Bennett deliberative, but it is to me very strongly suggested by the examples on page 187, in the paragraph labeled Illustrations of Origin; there we have an imperative preceding the repudiating question. This view was set forth by Professor Fay in The Classical Review 11. 345 ff.; see also The Classical Quarterly 5. 185 (July, 1911). To Professor Bennett the subjunctive of repudiating question is the subjunctive of inquiry after a command, "but the indignant attitude of the speaker develops a repudiating force" (186). If this is so, why doubt, as our author does (189), concerning the nature of the *-ne* with such questions? It must be interrogative. In The Classical Quarterly 5. 185 Professor Fay, on the principle that "psychological opposites take the same construction", now explains the repudiating question as "a clear opposite to the concessive". He thus agrees with Professor Bennett in making the construction fundamentally volitive, and must take *-ne* as interrogative. But Professor Bennett (178) finds but a single example of the jussive subjunctive used as concessive. On pages 198-199 Professor Bennett makes the subjunctive in *adeas velim* and the like potential, rejecting Professor Morris's theory (A. J. P. XVIII. 139, 284 ff.) that the subjunctive is really due to attraction by parataxis from the mood of the other verb. I agree rather with Professor Morris. One advantage of his theory is that it applies equally well to such forms as *patrem atque matrem viverent vellem tibi* (A. J. P. XVIII 159). The theory that the mood in *vellem* is potential leads to difficulties (that Professor Bennett cannot solve: 203); one is that on this theory the reference should be to past time, whereas in fact the reference is regularly to the present. The theory that *vellem dicere possem* is written because the speaker has in mind, as his real thought, *utinam dicere possem*, seems to me an easy explanation.

One great merit of Professor Bennett's book is that it will stimulate discussion and lead to renewed investigation, not merely of the facts but of their explanation. His book shows that phenomena whose frequency might be taken for granted are in fact rare, and that many matters not deemed worthy of comment by editors deserve careful consideration. To have laid a solid foundation for work in a great field is distinction enough for any one, however much his results may be questioned in detail.

CHARLES KNAPP.

Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum Libri qui Supersunt. Recensuit Rhythmicèque Distinxit CAROLUS U. CLARK adiuvantibus Ludovico Traube et Guilelmo Heraeo. Vol. I, libri XIV-XXV, accedunt Tabulae Quinque. Berolini, apud Weidmannos, MDCCCXC, 25 + 387 pp., 16 Marks.

This sumptuous critical edition deserves a warm welcome. It is not only an excellent piece of work in itself, but now that Gardthausen's text has disappeared from the Teubner series, it is our only modern edition of one of the most important and interesting authors in the later history of the Empire. Ammianus was a man of deeds as well as a man of words. Occasional glimpses of his personality, a passing reference here and there to his own experiences or to events in which he himself took an active part suggest a man whose life, if we had it before us, would read like a novel of adventure. Even his style in itself, with its inequalities and incongruities, its jostling of the old and new, the high and low, the foreign and native, is curiously suggestive of the age in which he lived, those times of upheaval, stress, and turmoil—moral, political, and social—which accompanied the decay and disintegration of the ancient world.

The edition is to consist of two volumes. The first, which is now before us, contains a praefatio (XI pp.), books XII-XXV of the text, and five pages in facsimile of important MSS. The second volume is already in press. It will contain the remainder of the text (books XXVI-XXXI), a more detailed discussion of the textual tradition, etc., and notes. Readers of the *Journal* will also be glad to learn that the editor intends to add a list of imitations and a complete index verborum. In view of Ammianus' unique relation to his predecessors and of his stylistic importance, these two indices will be sufficient in themselves to give Professor Clark's edition a real and permanent value.

The more we investigate the work of this author, and the more we know of the language and literary art of his time, the more clearly do we recognize and appreciate the magnitude of the task which Professor Clark has set before him. Those, however, who are familiar with his *Text Tradition of Ammianus Marcellinus* (New Haven, 1904) have already formed a high opinion of his ability and training as a textual critic.

The arrangement of the apparatus criticus—a matter of unusual difficulty in this particular author—is sufficiently set forth in the praefatio, and is as clear and simple as circumstances will permit. Beside the usual acknowledgements and explanations there is also a brief survey of the textual tradition illustrated by a stemma codicum. A discussion, however, of these questions, even if it were possible in this brief notice, really ought to be deferred, as the editor himself suggests, until

the completion of his work. In the meantime, therefore, I content myself with a brief reference to that feature of the book which is described on the title-page by the phrase 'rhythmicæ distinxit'.

Nowadays, of course, no good scholar is unaware of the part played by the rhythmical clausula in the cultivated prose of all languages. The Greeks, however, and after them the Romans, have surpassed all others in their national consciousness of its existence and in their study of its possibilities and limitations. Hence, as students of Meyer's *Ludus de Antichristo*, of Zielinski's *Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden* (A. J. P. XXV. 453), etc., are quite aware, a knowledge of the rhythmical clausulae of Latin prose is of special value, not only as a criterion of period, of style, and of schools of oratory, but also of pronunciation and occasionally even of textual tradition.

The laws of the cursus as we find it in Ammianus are comparatively simple. The main rule is that the last two accents of the phrase must be separated from each other by either two or four syllables, never by three or one. The intervening syllables may be either long or short. It is interesting to observe that final vowels are never elided and that *u* and *i* may be treated either as vowels or as consonants. Note, too, that Greek words here retain their native accent. Exceptions are very rare. Clark illustrates by the following examples, arranged under the three types 'planus', 'tardus', 'velox'. The adjective in each case is meant to describe the specific rhetorical effect of the type to which it is applied.

Cursus planus :	expediti ^o nis eu ^e ntus	XIV, 1, 1
	ill ^u c transit ^u rus	XIV, 6, 16
	A ^e gyptum p ^e tens	XXII, 5, 7
	r ^e gna Pers ⁱ dis	XXIII, 5, 16
cursus tardus :	p ^a rtium ^a nimis	XIV, 1, 1
	instrum ^e nta non l ^e uia	XIV, 6, 18
cursus velox :	fr ^e gerat et lab ^o rum	XIV, 1, 1
	relat ^u ri quae aud ⁱ rent	XIV, 1, 6
	obi ^e cti sunt praeter m ^o rem	XIV, 2, 2
	A ^e gypto trucid ^a tur	XIV, 11, 32
	gram ⁱ nea prope r ⁱ uum	XXIV, 8, 7
	n ^o mine adloc ^u tus est	XV, 6, 3
	inc ^e nsas et habit ^a cula	XVIII, 2, 19

The use of the cursus as a criterion of punctuation, though new in our times, is, of course, not the invention of Professor Clark. We find it, for instance, in such recent editions of Latin authors as Stricker's text of *Hrotswitha* (1906) and Ziegler's *Maternus, De Errore Profanarum Religionum* (1909). Stricker and Ziegler, however, use special marks (short vertical lines) for this purpose. Clark uses the ordinary forms. This not only

saves the page from disfigurement, but at least for us, in fact for all who have not been trained to the German system of punctuation, it is quite sufficient.

The application of this criterion to the punctuation of Latin texts impresses me as a long step in the right direction. Incidentally, it calls the attention of the modern reader (whose ear is, for the most part, totally untrained) to one of the most important aspects of Latin prose style. This, however, is only incidental. The real reason is that the *cursus* is by its very nature, by the mere fact of its existence, the herald of a pause. If, therefore, we punctuate accordingly, we are actually marking the rhetorical pauses observed by the author himself in the reading of his own sentences.

Theoretically, of course, a uniform system of punctuation the world over would seem to be a most desirable thing, a matter to be urged by the advocates of phonetic spelling and of similar labor-saving devices. The Germans, for example, as against the rest of the world, are in the habit of pointing off dependent clauses (relative, conditional, etc.) even in cases where no actual pause exists. How puzzling this can be to the average American boy is well-known to any classical instructor who in making examination papers has drawn his test passages from a German edition without modifying the punctuation in accordance with our system. Experience, however, has demonstrated that the punctuation of prose in all times and tongues cannot be reduced to a common denominator. It varies with the average type of sentence to be considered, and the average type of sentence is affected by period as well as by nationality. It varies with the tendencies by which it is affected and the determinant of variation is rhetoric. More than one striking illustration is furnished by the long history of our own language and literature. To cite a single case, those who are familiar with the prose of Robert Greene have discovered for themselves that it loses not a little of its distinctive quality, indeed, that it often becomes awkward and even unintelligible, if punctuated in accordance with modern standards. Uncertain and arbitrary as it often is, the usage of the Elizabethan printers is to be preferred because it interferes less with the peculiar rhetoric and sentence-construction so characteristic of the Euphuistic style.

In the case of a Latin author, notably in the case of Ammianus as he now lies before us, we are not obliged to consider the vagaries of printers nor the carelessness of authors themselves. We can appeal to a test which, so far as it goes, is absolutely certain. Let us take as an illustration XIV, I, 2, which runs as follows:

cuius acerbitati uxor graue accésserat incentíuum, germanitate Augusti túrgida supra módu, quam Anniballiano regi fratris filio antehac Constantinus iúnxerat páter, Megaera quaédam mortális, inflammatrix saeuiéntis adsídua, humani cruoris auida

nihil mītiūs quam marītus. qui paulatim eruditiores facti processu tēporis ad nocēdum, per clandestinos uersútosque rumigérulos, conpertis leuiter addere quaedam male suétos, falsa et placentia sibi discētes, adfectati regni uel artium nefandarum calumnias insóntibus adfigēbant.

The student who reads this passage, and in fact any passage of Ammianus, with an attempt to reproduce the value of the *cursus*, and to observe the pauses by which it is marked, will discover for himself that these strange semi-amorphous sentences, with their long series of bewildering dependent clauses clogged with adjectives, weighted with ablative absolutes, tangled with present participles, and the like, have suddenly become not only more intelligible but more musical and impressive. He has begun to understand the historian's rhetoric, to feel the effect of his stylistic devices, to realize their purpose and to estimate their value. In short, he has taken a step towards repeating in his own consciousness the impressions of those who listened to these sentences as they fell from the author's own lips. This is as it should be. Latin prose was addressed to the ear, not to the eye. We shall never discover its secrets unless we keep this rule constantly in mind. In fact, just at this time it is important to remember that the ear is the final, the indispensable test of any prose. Thanks to the printing press, a large share of our modern authors seem to have forgotten that in the artistic sense language, unlike children, is meant to be 'heard, not seen'.

But apart from its merit and usefulness, this edition is interesting as a sign of the times. It was only yesterday that we who dwell beyond the Ocean Stream were practically debarred from critical work of this sort, merely through distance from the necessary sources. Rapid transit, however, scores its victories in the Republic of Letters as well as in the world at large. This critical text is by an American editor, his coadjutor is a German scholar, and the work is being done under the auspices of the Berlin Academy. As such, it is the worthy beginning of a new and, we trust, a long and brilliant era in the tradition of classical culture and classical scholarship.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR PHILOGIE, Vol. LXV (1910).

Pp. 1-21. Weitere Bemerkungen zu den attischen Rechnungs- und Uebergabeurkunden. W. Bannier. Supplementary notes to two earlier articles, LXI 202-231 and LXIII 423-444. The chief point brought out here is the lack of uniformity in the grouping of these records.

Pp. 22-87. Tibulls erste Elegie. Ein Beitrag zum Verständniss der Tibullischen Kunst. F. Jacoby. Conclusion of an article begun in Vol. LXIV 601-632. The writer argues, and afterwards assumes, that the first elegy of Tibullus is later than the first book of Propertius. He finds in it two distinct poems, the first bucolic (lines 1-50 and 75-78) derived from Horace, Epod. II, the second erotic (lines 53-74) derived from Propertius, I 6, I 17, I 19. The second is a "Cento aus Properz und Komödie", and a rather poor cento at that. Indeed, Tibullus was merely a dilettante who derived most of his erotic material from Propertius. He was not fitted either by nature or by experience to treat of such subjects. To be sure, Quintilian and Ovid have a rather high opinion of his elegies, but their authority need no longer impose on us. They are "an sich und für uns nicht kompetent".

Pp. 88-120. Bobiensia. Neue Beiträge zu den Bobienser Ciceroscholien. Th. Stangl. I. Notes referring to the Pro Flacco, the Cum populo gratias egit, and the Pro Plancio.

Pp. 121-129. Apollodoros περί γῆς? Ulrich Hoefer. A refutation of B. Niese's conjecture (Hermes, XLIV 161 ff.) that the Periegesis of Skymnos was derived from Apollodoros.

Pp. 130-148. Zur Schlachtordnung der Manipulare. Th. Steinwender.

Pp. 149-155. Aus dem antiken Schulunterricht. A. Brinkmann. Description of a number of tablets which served as school-books in Graeco-Roman Egypt, in the third century A. D. They have been published by Kenyon, J. H. S., XXIX 29 ff. One contains an exercise in "declinatio per casus" by a method which probably goes back to the early days of the Empire.

Miszellen.—Pp. 156-7. Th. Gomperz. Zu Kallimachos. In Epig. 54, 3 read: γινώσκεις. ἦν δ' αὖ σε λάβῃ <ποτέ> καί μιν ἀπαιτῆς. Or instead of <ποτέ> read <πάλι> and call πάλι καὶ hyperbaton for καὶ πάλι, 'und von neuem'.—Pp. 157-60. W. Crönert. Die

beiden ältesten griechischen Briefe. A study of two short letters of the fourth century B. C., one found at Athens, in 1888, the other in Olbia.

Pp. 161-168. Didaskalika. J. H. Lipsius. A study of the old question whether the poet himself or the didaskalos who trained the chorus for him was officially recognized as victor. E. Capps (A. J. P. XXVIII 179 ff.) held the former view; Lipsius here supports the latter.

Pp. 169-174. Commentatiuncula quinta ad Libanii ed. Foersterianam. H. van Herwerden.

Pp. 175-199. Zu Hierokles dem Neuplatoniker. A. Elter. The work of Hierokles consisted of seven λόγοι and an introduction. It was probably composed about 415 A. D. A study of the methods of Photius, the chief authority on the subject.

Pp. 200-232. Minos. E. Bethe. Minos was originally the god of the Kefti who occupied Crete in the 15th century B. C. About 1400 B. C. the palaces of Knosos and Phaistos were destroyed, and the Kefti were dispersed. Traces of their later influence may be seen in various cities named Minoa, in Sicily, in Greece, and in Phoenicia. Minos was a bull-god. The conquest of the Cretan Bull by Herakles perhaps means the conquest of the Kefti by the Cretan Dorians. The stories which connect the name of Minos with Attica and Megara are based upon the struggle of two early races for the possession of Attica.

Pp. 233-248. De Manilio et Tiberio Caesare. E. Bickel. The Caesar to whom the poem was addressed was Tiberius.

Pp. 249-269. Bobiensia. Neue Beiträge zu den Bobienser Ciceroscholien. III. Th. Stangl. Notes referring to the Pro Plancio, the Pro Milone, and the Pro Sestio.

Pp. 270-305 and 359-419. Ueber die Form der Darstellung in Livius Geschichtswerk. K. Witte. A long study of the manner in which Livy has embellished his history by working out special events and situations in detail. Pp. 381-397 set forth his regular procedure in describing the course of a battle. Various passages in Bks. 30-45 and 21-22—among them, the account of Hannibal's crossing of the Alps—are here compared with the corresponding passages of Polybius.

Miszellen.—Pp. 306-308. W. Crönert. Zu Kallimachos. In 54. 3 read γιγνώσκειν. ἦν δ' ἄρα λάβη καὶ μι<σθδ>ν ἀπαιτῆς.—Pp. 308-309. A. Kretschmar. Quaestio comica. Wilamowitz has pronounced that a certain Greek fragment, Oxyr. Pap., VI 855, p. 150, cannot belong to Menander, because it shows the article in the last foot of the verse. Here Kretschmar cites five cases of this particular usage from the fragments of Menander.—Pp. 309-310. S. Sudhaus. Aristophanes Acharner 490-498. In 494 read ἀντροῦ τὸ πρᾶγμα· εἰς νυν.—Pp. 310-313. S. Sudhaus. Zu

Diogenes von Oinoanda. The passage in which Diogenes makes Aristotle a skeptic may be based upon the misinterpretation of the abbreviation of a proper name. The proper name intended would be Ἀρκεσίλαος.—Pp. 313-316. R. Philippson. Zu Philodem *περὶ σημειώσεων*.—Pp. 316-317. Karl Meiser. Zu Tacitus, *dialogus* c. 37. For "ut *secura* velint" read "ut *securam curam* velint".—Pp. 317-318. Th. Birt. Zur Phyllenordnung Alexandrias. This must have been one of the earliest measures of Nero's reign, in November or December of the year 54.—P. 318. G. Mercati. Quando mori G. Lascaris. The precise date, December 7, 1534, is given by Cod. Vat. Gr. 2240.—Pp. 319-320. A. Brinkmann. Textual notes on the Ninos romance published by Wilcken, *Hermes*, XXVIII 161 ff.

Pp. 321-330. Zu dem neugefundenen arkadischen Synoikievertrag. F. Solmsen. (1) Ἐπὶ Χαιριάδαι means "in the time of Chairiadas". Chairiadas is not the eponymos of the current year, but of a somewhat earlier year. (2) Because of its use of *η* for *ε* before vowels Solmsen would put the inscription well into the third century B. C. (3) The proper name *Εὐαίμνιοι* may be derived from the substantive **αἶμος*, a cognate of the German 'Seele', Goth. 'saiwala', O. H. G. 'sêula, sêla'.

Pp. 331-338. Appunti sul palinsesto Vat. gr. 1456. G. Mercati. Notes on the only manuscript which has transmitted the original text of the Onomasticon of Eusebius. The other manuscripts are all mere copies of this one. The writer is inclined to believe, with Batiffol, that it was written in Southern Italy. He reports a long lacuna in the middle of the manuscript, and suggests that the next editor should examine carefully Bodl. Misc. 211.

Pp. 339-344. Die Listen griechischer Profanschriftsteller. Hugo Rabe. The text of 'Tabula C' from a Bodleian MS, Barocc. 125. It is here compared with Vat. 1456 and Bodl. Misc. 211.

Pp. 345-351. Nachträgliches zu Vergils Catalepton. Th. Birt. In IX 35 'raptus' means rape or ravishment, not necessarily a carrying away. The 'hirnea' of XII suggests that Atilius was a potter. The mention of the 'compitalia' in XIII 27 suggests that the poem was written before 44 B. C., probably before 46 B. C. Other notes on II b, III a 1, VII, XI 4, IX 31.

Pp. 352-358. Das Schlachtfeld am Trasimenersee. F. Reuss. A criticism of Kromayer's recent theory as to the scene of the battle.

Pp. 420-440. Bobiensia. Neue Beiträge zu den Bobienser Ciceroscholien. IV. Th. Stangl. Notes referring to the In Vatinius, the Pro Milone, the Pro Archia, the Pro Sulla.

Pp. 441-460. Zwei Bemerkungen zur Technik der Komödie. W. Süss. (1) A comparison of the prologue of the Roman

Comedy with the prooimion of the rhetoricians and with the parabasis of the Attic Comedy. (2) A study of the close of the comedy, both Roman and Greek.

Pp. 461-471. *Variae lectiones*. W. Crönert. (1) A defense of the verb *μνήσκειται* in Anacreon, 90 B. (2) Support of Blass's suggestion, *ἑσαΐειν* = 'sentire', in Hippocrates, *De Morbis*, IV. (3) In Lucian's *Podagra*, 8, read: *εἰς φῶς ἀνῆκε νηλὲς ἀνθρώποις βλάβος*. (4) The expression '*psolo copumai*', Lucilius, 304 M., is to be explained by a vulgar Greek verb lately supplied by the London papyri, *ψωλοκοπῶ* = *ἐνοχλῶ τὴν ψωλήν*.

Miszellen.—P. 472. L. Radermacher. Zu Platons *Menon*. In 91 C for *συγγενῶν* read *σύ γε νῶν*.—Pp. 472-473. L. Radermacher. *Metrische Inschrift*. Note on a Doric inscription, apparently of the sixth century B. C. The proper name *Εὐμάρες* (= nom.) stands at the beginning of the hexameter by a special metrical license.—Pp. 473-474. A. Körte. Zu dem Berliner metrischen Papyrus.—Pp. 474-475. Th. Birt. *Lares semitales*. These are referred to in Virgil, *Catal.* X. 20.—Pp. 475-480. R. Sabbadini. Zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des *Codex Mediceus (M)* des Vergilius. About 1470 the *Codex Mediceus* was taken from the Benedictine monastery of Bobbio to the church of St. Paul at Rome. In the years 1500-1507 it was in the Vatican. It was taken to the Vatican later than 1484, and disappeared from that library before 1521. It seems to have been stolen from the Vatican, and for some time carefully concealed.

Pp. 481-503. *Zur lateinischen Anthologie*. A. Riese. (1) Supplementary notes to the author's edition of the *Anthology* (1894, 1906). (2) The text of the poems of Isidorus of Sevilla, with critical apparatus and notes. The poems are modeled on the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* of Martial.

Pp. 504-514. *Aus Sopatros Μεταποιήσεις*. S. Glöckner. Text and textual notes.

Pp. 515-538. *Zum Aufbau der Aristophanischen Lieder*. S. Sudhaus. The writer finds in Aristophanes the same symmetrical structure as he recently set forth in his '*Aufbau der Plautinischen Cantica*'. He analyzes the *parodos* of the *Lysistrata*, and examines various other compositions, *proodic*, *epodic*, *palinodic*, and *mesodic*. Reverting to Plautus, he analyzes the *canticum* of the *Captivi*, 516-540, and applies his theory to the improvement of the text of 502 and the punctuation of 510. In 502 '*lassum*' is an interpolation; in 510 '*hic*' goes with what precedes, not with what follows.

Pp. 539-577. *De Menandri codice Cairensi*. Ch. Jensen. Report of a recent examination of these fragments: (1) *Ad Disceptantes*; (2) *Ad Samiam*; (3) *Ad Circumtonsam*; (4) *Ad Heroem*.

Pp. 578-605. Die Nomenklatur der materfamilias vor dem Jahre 527/227. E. Bickel. A study suggested by an archaic inscription, CIL. XIV 4270, in which the wife bears the husband's name, 'Poublilia Turpilia'. The inscription belongs to the middle of the sixth century, and Etruscan influence has been suggested.

Pp. 606-616. 'Ὀδοιπορία ἀπὸ 'Εδέμ τοῦ παραδείσου ἄχρι τῶν Ῥωμαίων (Zur 'Expositio totius mundi et gentium', Geogr. lat. min., ed. Riese, 1878, p. 104 sq.). A. Klotz.

Pp. 617-626. Die Protheorie zur Biographie eines Neuplatonikers. A. Brinkmann.

Pp. 627-634. Firmicianiana. F. Skutsch. A comparison of the language of Firmicus with that of Manilius.

Miszellen.—Pp. 635-636. Ch. Jensen. Zu Menanders Epitrepontes (v. 432-456).—Pp. 636-637. W. Crönert. Ein Epigramm aus Astypalaia.—Pp. 637-639. E. Lattes. Ancora dei numerali e dei nomi di mese etruschi (cf. Rh. Mus. 1902, LVII 318-320). The strongest argument for Etr. 'ci' = 'three' is based on the mistaken reading of an inscription. More likely 'ci' meant 'five'. The Etruscan name for 'October' was 'utofer', or 'ut(t)ofer'.—Pp. 639-640. A. Klotz. Ein Luciliuszitat. On Ter. Eun. 491 Donatus remarks: "antiquum verbum est 'cibum petere e flamma'". This refers to Lucilius, 659 Marx: 'mordicus petere e flamma expediat, e caeno cibum'.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

ROMANIA, Vol. XXXIX (1910).

Janvier.

Paul Meyer. Les Enfances Gauvain: Fragments d'un poème perdu. 32 pages. Two leaves (one of them double) of a thirteenth century manuscript recently discovered in the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève at Paris contain portions of an otherwise unknown French epic belonging to the Arthurian Cycle. There is a lengthy discussion of its relation to other epics, as well as a critical edition of the fragmentary text.

Mario Roques. Fragments d'un ms. du Roman de Renart (Branches I et VII). 11 pages. Three fragments of a thirteenth century manuscript of the Roman de Renart were recovered from the binding of a Latin manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. The text gives indication of a complicated scribal tradition.

Paul Meyer. *Prière en Quatrains à la Vierge: Sermons* (Ms. B. N. fr. 24838). 10 pages. The text here published is intercalated in a volume of sermons by Maurice de Sully. This is one of a large number of similar poems.

Arthur Långfors. *La Vie de Sainte Catherine par le peintre Estienne Lanquelier* (Bibl. Nat., lat. 1379). 7 pages. An illuminator of manuscripts has here turned poet, and has inserted the text here published in a Book of Hours copied in the fifteenth century.

Hermann Suchier. *La Fille sans Mains*, II. 16 pages. A Latin prose tale concerning a King of France and his daughter who fled from home and married one of her father's vassals. The orthography, forms of expression and style of the text published are all rather curious.

Mélanges. Amos Parducci et P. Meyer, *Fragment d'un ancien Chansonnier Provençal* (Bibliothèque Classense de Ravenne, No. 165). T. Atkinson Jenkins, *Melite*. D. S. Blondheim, *Anc. franç. moisseron*. A.-T. Baker, *Anc. franç. escomos, escoymous*. P. M., *Martin-baton*. Gustave Cohen, *Notes sur le mystère de Saint-Quentin*. E. Philipot, *Les "Scieurs d'ais"*. A. Thomas, *Le Père Menfouté et la "Mort de Roland"*.

Comptes rendus. Jessie L. Weston, *The Legend of Sir Perceval: Studies upon its Origin, Development and Position in the Arthurian Cycle*, Vol. II (G. Huet). J. Anglade, *Le Troubadour Rigaut de Barbezieux* (P. M.). D. H. Carnahan, *Jean d'Abondance: A Study of his Life and Three of his Works* (P. M.). Géraud Lavergne, *Le Parler bourbonnais aux XIV^e et XV^e Siècles: Etude philologique de textes inédits* (A. Thomas). Arsène Darmesteter, *Les Gloses françaises de Raschi dans la Bible, accompagnées de notes par Louis Brandin et précédées d'une introduction par Julien Weill* (A. Thomas). Wendelin Foerster, *Kristian von Troyes Erec und Enide, zweite Auflage* (A. Thomas). Denis Roche, *Contes limousins recueillis dans l'Arrondissement de Rochechouart: Texte patois et texte français* (A. Thomas). Dante, *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*, edited and translated by Charles Lancelot Shadwell (Paget Toynbee).

Périodiques. *Revue des langues romanes*, LII (P. M.). *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXXIII. 1 (Mario Roques). *Romanische Forschungen*, XIX. 1-3 (Mario Roques). *Revue de Philologie française et provençale*, XXII (P. M.). *Annales du Midi*, XXI (A. Th.). *Revista Lusitana*, IX-XI (P. M.). *Reale Istituto lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Rendiconti*, série II, t. XLII. *Fünftehnter Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache zu Leipzig* (M. Roques).

Avril-Juillet.

D. S. Blondheim. *Contribution à la Lexicographie française*

d'après des Sources rabbiniques. 55 pages. Various scholars have investigated the French language used by the Jews of Mediaeval France, and the results of their studies have been of great use to etymologists. The present monograph, a doctor's dissertation of the Johns Hopkins University, is based largely on an unpublished twelfth century Jewish ritual which has been preserved in two manuscripts now in New York and Oxford. Other Hebrew manuscripts in various European libraries have also been drawn on occasionally, and the relations existing between the Jews of France and those of Spain in the Middle Ages are likewise touched upon.

Antoine Thomas. *Notes étymologiques et lexicographiques : Nouvelle série.* 84 pages. The present article consists of some sixty-seven headings under which a large number of French words, both literary and dialectic, are studied in reference to their etymologies. An extensive index arranged by languages facilitates reference to any given form which has been cited in the text.

P. Meyer. *Le Salut Notre Dame : La Lettre de Prêtre Jean* (fragment appartenant à la Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève). 9 pages. The short texts here published formed part of a thirteenth century manuscript copied to the north of Paris. Two lists of manuscripts are included in this article.

Gertrude Schoepperle. *The Love-Potion in Tristan and Isolt.* 20 pages. The period of the efficacy of the love-potion in this famous story was variously stated by Mediaeval authors, and the present study is an attempt to trace the development of the conception. In even the earliest extant versions the redactors have worked the original Celtic idea over so thoroughly with moral intent that it has become of a piece with themselves,—twelfth century, French, and Christian through and through.

C. Brunel. *Randon, Protecteur des Troubadours.* 8 pages. The history of a noble family of the twelfth century shows that one of its members gave special protection to a number of Provençal troubadours.

Giulio Bertoni. *Note e Correzioni all' antico testo piemontese dei "Parlamenti ed Epistole".* 10 pages. A diplomatic reproduction of this thirteenth century text is given, accompanied by a critical study of its linguistic characteristics.

Margaret H. Jackson. *Antonio Pucci's Poems in the Codice Kirkupiano of Wellesley College.* 9 pages. This manuscript has belonged in recent years successively to Mr. Kirkup, an English artist living in Florence, Mr. Wild, Mr. Plimpton, and has at length found a resting-place in the Library of Wellesley College. It is contemporaneous with Antonio Pucci, and contains the *Filostrato* of Boccaccio in addition to the former's poems.

Arthur Piaget. *Ballades de Guillebert de Lannoy et de Jean de Werchin.* 45 pages. A manuscript of the Musée Condé at Chantilly contains a number of French ballads of the beginning of the fifteenth century, some of which were composed in his youth by the celebrated traveler and diplomat Guillebert de Lannoy. The poems contain a discussion of the problems usual to the Court of Love of their day. Some forty-six ballads are here published.

Mélanges. F. Rechnitz, *Sur le vers 213 de la Vie de Saint Alexis.* Ch. Bémont, *Wace et la Bataille de Hastings.* A. Thomas, *Le Dauphin Louis, fils de Charles VI, amateur du théâtre.* E. Picot, *Le Poète Jehan Drouyn.*

Comptes Rendus. Myrrha Borodine, *La femme et l'amour au XII^e siècle d'après les poèmes de Chrétien de Troyes* (Mario Roques). Mary Rh. Williams, *Essai sur la composition du roman gallois de Peredur* (Mario Roques). Eduard Wechssler, *Das Kulturproblem des Minnesangs* (Ferdinand Lot). Lage F. W. Staël von Holstein, *Le Roman d'Athis et Prophilias: Étude littéraire sur ses deux versions* (G. Huet). W. Meyer-Lübke, *Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache, I. Laut- und Flexionslehre* (A. Thomas). G. Millardet, *Recueil de textes des anciens dialectes landais* (A. Thomas). Mathias Friedwagner, *La Vengeance Raguidel, altfranzösischer Abenteuerroman* (Gaston Raynaud).

Périodiques. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXXIII. 2-6 (Mario Roques). *Buletinul Societății Filologice*, II (Mario Roques).

Chronique. Obituary notices of André Devaux, Henry d'Arbois de Jubainville, Jean Mongin, Adolf Tobler and Edvard Lidforss. Adjutor Rivard has published an etymological note on the word *Esterlet* in Canadian French.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 25 titles. R. Miquel y Planas has begun the publication of a *Nova Biblioteca Catalana: Novelari catalan de les segles XIV a XVIII* (Four numbers have already appeared). *Le livre du Chastel de Labour, par Jean Bruyant: A Description of an Illuminated Manuscript of the Fifteenth Century, belonging to George C. Thomas, Philadelphia, with a short account and synopsis of the poem.* Fr. Bliss Luquiens, *An Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology.* Florence Nightingale Jones, *Boccaccio and his Imitators in German, English, French, Spanish and Italian Literature: The Decameron* ("constitue un utile instrument de recherches"). N. I. Apostolescu, *L'ancienne versification roumaine (XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles).* A. Wallensköld, *La construction du complément des comparatifs et des expressions comparatives dans les langues romanes.* A. Terracher, *Aulica, fr. ouche.* Edmund Stengel, *Huon's aus Auvergne Höllenfahrt, nach der*

Berliner und Paduaner Hs. Enrico Carrara, *La poesia pastorale* (*Storia dei generi letterari italiani*). Enrico Sannia, *Il comico, l'umorismo e la satira nella Divina Commedia*.

Octobre.

C. Salvioni. *Miscellanea Etimologica e Lessicale*. 43 pages. Seventy-five words belonging to the Italian literary language and especially to the dialects are investigated etymologically.

E. Philipon. *Les Parlers du Duché de Bourgogne aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*. 56 pages. Many years ago Fallot divided the dialects of North France into three groups, of which the Burgundian was the typical form of one. Later investigators made a further division of the Burgundian group by leaving out the Western dialects. Now, however, a still further distinction is made according to which the Burgundian dialect is considered to be independent of the Lorraine and Champagne dialects as well. Numerous linguistic documents are edited from the originals in the archives, after which the linguistic characteristics of these texts are investigated with considerable minuteness.

Paul Meyer. *Notice du Ms. Egerton 745 du Musée britannique* (*Vies de Saint Eustache, en vers, des saints Denis, Martin de Vertou, Gildas, Édouard, Barlaam et Josaphat, en prose, le Pseudo-Caton de Jean de Chatelet, etc.*). 38 pages. The manuscript here described in detail has many points of unusual interest. It can be definitely traced from owner to owner for some time before it entered the British Museum; it is an unusually beautiful manuscript which M. Paul Meyer has studied at intervals since 1865; it was written contemporaneously by two scribes, but having later lost its first quire, the work of one scribe was intercalated in the midst of the other's work when it was rebound several centuries ago; it is beautifully illuminated and carefully written on very fine vellum; it contains various works in prose and poetry hitherto unknown to scholars. This article is to be continued in a later number.

Giulio Bertoni. *Un Frammento di una Versione perduta del Roman de Troie*. 10 pages. This is an Italian translation of Benoît de Sainte-More's *Roman de Troie* which is independent of Guido delle Colonne's Latin version. This fragment undoubtedly belonged to the middle of a large manuscript which may once have formed a part of the celebrated Este library at Ferrara. The fact that this version was written in the Venetian dialect throws an interesting sidelight on the literary relations between France and Italy in the fourteenth century.

Mélanges. L. Constans, *Miscere en ancien français*. Ch.-V. Langlois, *Anc. franç. pichar*. Edmond Faral, "*L'etre*" dans une chanson française. E. Weekley, *A propos de l'anc. franç. escomos, escoymous*. A. Thomas, *Le père de Martial d'Auvergne*.

Comptes rendus. *Mélanges offerts à M. Emile Chatelain* (Gustave Cohen). *Mélanges de philologie romane et d'histoire littéraire offerts à M. Maurice Wilmotte* (Mario Roques). Lorenzo Mascetta-Caracci, *Dante e il "Dedalo" Petrarchesco, con uno studio sulle malattie del Petrarca* (Henry Cochin).

Périodiques. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXXIV. 1 (Mario Roques). *Romanische Forschungen*, XX. 1-3 (Mario Roques). *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur*, XXX-XXXV (A. Jeanroy, Edm. Faral). *Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français*, XXXIV.

Chronique. Obituary notices of Alfred Nutt, Fr. J. Furnivall, Armand d'Herbomez, Léopold Delisle, Ernest Martin, Pierre Aubry, Hermann Breymann, John E. Matzke and J.-B. Cerlogne.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 13 titles. T. Atkinson Jenkins, *Eructavit, an Old French metrical Paraphrase of Psalm XLIV*, published from all known manuscripts and attributed to Adam de Perseigne. Raymond Weeks, *Chevalerie Vivien: Facsimile Phototypes of the Sancti Bertini manuscript of the Bibliothèque municipale of Boulogne-sur-Mer, with an Introduction and Notes*. Paget Toynbee, *Dante Alighieri: His Life and Works*. John M. Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence, d'après le ms. 413 de Valenciennes*.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

BRIEF MENTION.

A candid confession is good for the soul, as the saying is, however bad it may be for the reputation, and *Brief Mention* is my confessional; and so I frankly confess that next to translations, I have learned to abominate historical novels, once the joy of my heart. For me, in my old age, historical novels fall into just two classes. Either I know the period after a fashion and then I am irritated by all manner of trifling incongruities or harassed by importunate questionings; or I don't know the period and then I am filled with disgust at my own ignorance, a disgust not unaccompanied by a vague suspicion of my authority for the time being. Correcting exercises, correcting proof breeds a deplorably criticastrous habit of mind. 'One can always give one's self up to one's impressions' said Oscar Wilde to me once with an air of profound conviction. Alas! that holds too well of the queasiness that so easily besets one as one reaches the multitudinous seas of the historical novel. In one of Ebers' performances the functionary known to Diodoros as the 'paraschist' or 'side-slitter' appears as the 'paraschit'—doubtless a typographical error in a cheap edition, but I have forgotten the story and remember only the 'paraschit'. To a native South Carolinian it was not the least of Mrs. Stowe's crimes that she called her villain 'Legree', the popular pronunciation of Legaré, a name made illustrious by a famous jurist. To the ear of a native Athenian it would have been worse than a crime to call a slave, however honest, by the name of 'Antiphon', as happened the other day in a novel written 'out of an intimate knowledge and passionate love of things Greek'. The Antiphons were all gentlemen from Antiphon of Rhamnus down to the Antiphos of Plautus and Terence. Were there no slave names in Attica? One invokes Nemesis, the goddess of Rhamnus, and cries with Dionysos in the play, *πρὸς Ῥαμβίας*; In the same book there is a pretty scene in which a boy hero buries his hand in the pink blossoms of the almond tree, which flourishes for most of us only in the Authorized Version of Ecclesiastes, but we are in the month of April and the almond tree must have been long out of bloom according to Pliny. The trip from Athens to Megara is a day's journey. The distance in miles doesn't matter. Baedeker, practical German that he is, deals with hours not miles, and on my way from the Piraeus to Athens I had to fall back on the forty stades of Thukydides. But in the book I am thinking of 'Hoc iter ignavi divisimus' and the journey was broken at Eleusis. From Athens to Eleusis is two hours and a half by

carriage. 'Good walkers require four hours' says Baedeker, and yet our travellers start at sunrise and do not reach Eleusis until the cool of the evening—'weary with the first day's journeying', this strapping Spartan woman and this lively Athenian boy, who afterward leaps the whole way from Eleusis to Megara.

When we reach Nemea we are informed à propos of the Nemean games that 'gentle Pindar'—who is one of the characters of the book—'was as yet silent; only his heart within him was lifting and pulsing songs yet to be'. I have resented the comparison of Pindar to a mastodon (A. J. P. XXVI 115), but I should never have thought of him as a tame cat, and in 493 he must have been articulate, for he was only twenty when he indited the famous Tenth Pythian for Hippokleas of Thessaly. And indeed, further on, we are told that six years before the youthful hero was able 'to sing whole passages of Homer and almost all the odes that Pindar had as yet composed'—a slight inconsistency, which would not disturb the normal reader. It is an old observation that no department of literature is so full of chronological misstatements as memoirs, and yet memoirs are written or are supposed to be written out of intimate knowledge. I am making slow progress with the book, as slow as the hero and his mother made towards Eleusis, but I came very near refusing to take the trip at all because I was confronted at the outset by the improbable combination of an Athenian husband and a Spartan wife, the same combination one finds in other historical novels. True, the author is well aware of the unnaturalness of the whole thing, but the machinery by which the marriage is brought about does not work very well, and the details are not very satisfactory. True, there is one historical Athenian on record who buried a Lakonian wife, but that was after Eukleides, and if one must have such a union why not take Alkibiades and Timaiia, who were husband and wife 'in the sight of God'—a sentimental phrase which means 'by the instigation of the devil'? True, there was scant ceremony about a Spartan marriage, no wedding that could be called a wedding, but our Athenian bridegroom did not conform to the Spartan usage, as laid down in the books, and simply repeated the performance of Theseus, but more effectively. One loses one's self in imagining the trouble our Spartan *φαινομένης* had with the 'Saintes Nitouches' of Athens and the trouble the young father would have had when he came to register the boy in the *ληξιαρχικόν*. Fortunately the father died before the time came, and perhaps after all the Athenians were not so particular before the revision of Perikles. The boy went with his mother when she returned to Sparta and in a few days he learned to swear like the Spartans and the *μὰ τὸ θεῶ* of the Athenian women 'who', we are told 'talked that

half obsolete dialect which the men of Athens scarcely understood', became the *μὰ τὸ σιῶ* of the Spartan lads. But the theme is as inexhaustible as are the merits and demerits of translations, and this is *Brief Mention*.

Mr. PEARSON'S *Phoenissae* (Cambridge University) would have been noticed at some length long ago, if the editor had not diverted me from my purpose by bringing out HEADLAM'S *Agamemnon* and now that I despair of doing exact justice to the work of that remarkable scholar, I come back to Mr. PEARSON for a few inconsequential remarks. In his Introduction to the play, Mr. PEARSON quotes a marginal note of Macaulay's in which he recorded the confession: 'I can hardly account for the contempt which at school or college I felt for Euripides. I own that I like him now better than Sophocles'. 'It is a common experience', adds Mr. PEARSON, and he might have adduced the example of Wilamowitz, who tells us in a footnote to his edition of *Hercules Furens* (v. 637) how he talked to Jakob Bernays about Euripides in the bejaune style that Schlegel had brought into vogue, and how Bernays took down a text of the poet and read the beginning of the ode saying: 'Wait until you get older and you will see what that means'. That was in 1867. In 1867 Bernays, only a few years my senior, could not be called an old man, but he had reached the age when one begins to sigh for youth, the age when the Euripidean 'Qu'on est bien à vingt ans' begins to appeal to a man.¹ In any case it was a good selection to shew the charm of Euripides the Human, and it evidently impressed the future author of the *Analecta Euripidea*, the future *Sospitator Euripidis*. The personality of Bernays may have had something to do with it. In 1852-3 when I was at Bonn, I followed Bernays's lectures on Thukydides' speeches and Aristotle's Poetics, and, though he was in the beginning of his career as a teacher, he influenced me more profoundly than did some of my older and more distinguished professors. 'Though?' Perhaps I should have said, 'because'. The young teacher often produces by the edge of his own enthusiasm an effect which the weight of the senior's accumulated learning fails to make. I never think of Bernays without gratitude because it was he who led me into the study that resulted in my doctoral dissertation, which is an *aureum milliarium* in a student's life, in fact, the culmination of many careers. But in my talks with Bernays we never chanced upon Euripides, and for many years I was under the domination of Schlegel, and followed the trend of

¹ ἂ νεώτας μοι φίλον· ἀχθος δὲ τὸ γῆρας αἰεὶ | βαρύτερον Αἰτνας σκοπέλων ἐπὶ
κρατὶ κεῖται, | βλεφάρων σκοτεινὸν φάος ἐπικαλύψαν. | μή μοι μήτ' Ἀσιήτιδος | τυ-
ραννίδος δλβος εἴη, | μὴ χρυσοῦ δώματα πλήρη | τᾶς ἡβας ἀντιλαβεῖν, | ἂ καλλίστα
μὲν ἐν δλβῳ, | καλλίστα δ' ἐν πενίᾳ.

aesthetic criticism that swayed the Germany of my time. The average Teutonic Hellenist of that day was a 'Euripidesfresser' as Menzel was a 'Franzosenfresser' and it is not surprising that a youthful Teutonomanic should have been caught by what was really a national movement. 'Quo semel est imbuta recens', and for the twenty years of my service at the University of Virginia, Euripides was relegated to the category of extra-reading. But while I never went so far in my antagonism to Euripides as did Jebb (A. J. P. XXVIII 485) the experience of life has never brought me quite so far as it brought Macaulay; and the *Phoenissae* so long the butt of adverse criticism is not the play I should select as an introduction to the study of the great poet, whom it is safe enough to admire now.

Περιπαθεῖς ἄγαν αἱ Φοίνισσαι τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ, says the hypothesis and we cannot afford to thrust aside these old criticisms which a young scholar has recently done well to collect for the benefit of those who are apt to set up their own judgment against the traditional wisdom of antiquity. περιπαθεῖς ἄγαν αἱ Φοίνισσαι and the accumulation of horrors is not redeemed by the multitude of wise saws which would go far to redeem anything in the eyes of the ancient commentators, who all took Aeschines' practical view of the value of poetry which Krüger made the motto of his grammar. But the fact that the play was a famous play, 'that it held the stage after Euripides' death, and that it is one of those three which continued to be played until the later Byzantine era', would of itself make the *Phoenissae* an interesting problem; and as there has been no English edition of the play since Paley's, Mr. PEARSON has done good service in bringing to bear upon the elucidation of the *Phoenissae* the equipment which he has acquired in his previous editions of Euripidean plays, which do not belong to the *non ragioniam di lor* class with which so many manufactures are to be numbered. We are not in accord on many points of nomenclature and interpretation, but what of that? What if Mr. PEARSON calls the plural for the singular as others use an 'allusive' plural? 'Elusive' would be a better word, to judge by a recent monograph on the subject, but neither 'allusive' nor 'elusive' puts the finger on the phenomenon. 'Monistic' might answer and one has a choice between 'centripetal', which would be 'allusive', and 'centrifugal', which would be 'elusive'. What if Mr. PEARSON emphasizes the local element of the dative as do other noted scholars whereas I have insisted on the personal element in poetry and especially in Euripides with whom the semi-personification is a mania as is shown by his use of δοῦναι, which amounts to a sentimental mannerism? 'In poetry' I have said 'the warm personal dative is to be preferred everywhere to the cold local dative'

(A. J. P. XXIII 21) and 'instead of flattening antique personification let us emboss our own' (Pindar O. 2, 90). Of course, I am a slave to my own doctrines, but why emphasize them at the expense of a commentator who has earned a right to his own judgment in such matters? Why, I took up the other day a fire-new edition of Xenophon's *Anabasis* and found a lot of things that I might construe as flat contradictions of my teachings, if I dared to suppose that the run of commentators care for the discussions contained in the *Journal*. So boys are taught to translate *οὐκ ἦγον* as if it were *οὐκ ἤγαγον* (S. C. G. 216) which can only mean that *ἦγον* is an aoristic imperfect, a subversive doctrine, according to A. J. P. XXIV 180; XXIX 304 (cf. IV 160); they are taught that *πρίν* with infinitive = *πρίν* with optative (4, 5, 30) is a remarkable irregularity (A. J. P. II 476) and that there is no difference between *εἰ* with the future indicative and *εἰδν* with the subjunctive in a passage (3, 1, 13) which I might have cited thirty-five years ago to show the characteristic difference between the two constructions. The revolt against the dread alternative is followed by a sober calculation of chances—the every-day conditional. Now if these things are done in the dry tree of the *Anabasis*, which has been ground to sawdust by Joost, what might not be done in the green tree of Euripidean poetry? But I forbear.

Daos by the author of the treatise on Theocritus of which *Brief Mention* was made more than ten years ago (A. J. P. XXI 350) is just one of those books that I should like to condense for the benefit of those who have not the time to read a volume of nearly seven hundred pages on the New Comedy (*Daos, Tableau de la Comédie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle*. Paris, A. Fontemoing) for M. LEGRAND belongs to the new generation of French scholars who combine a knowledge of the results of Transrhenan learning with the native grace which outsiders must be content to envy, so that the toil is beguiled by the pleasure. Unfortunately in the condensation the charm would be lost. Of course, in this work much is said about the New Menander, which, to be frank, was a prodigious disappointment to those who had not been braced by previous undceptions. 'If we only had this and if we only had that', and when we get this and when we get that, we find that the best wine has lain in our bins all the while. I am contemporary with most of those disillusionments. The growl over Fronto (A. J. P. XXV 358) had not ceased its reverberation in the time of my apprenticeship (1850-1853). Every lecturer on Roman literature at that day fastened his hook in the prostrate form of the good old African and Naber's edition is a 'ducitur unco'. I think over all the great discoveries—Hypereides, intimately associated with my favorite teacher Schneidewin, Aristotle's Constitution

of Athens, Herondas, Bakchylides, Timotheos, the various lyric fragments—all welcome, all illuminating. It is not necessary to extol the treasures that Egypt has yielded, and yet there are moods in which one understands Mr. RIDGEWAY, whose outspokenness is delightful, when he says (*The Origin of Tragedy*, p. 148):

No matter how meritorious are the results of the labours of archaeologists and papyrographers, it must be confessed that neither the *Polity of the Athenians* nor the recently discovered work of an historian of the fourth century B. C., although valuable as historical documents, has much claim to literary merit. Bacchylides has proved very disappointing, and the recently discovered remains of Menander still more so, while the new fragments of Pindar have only furnished us with examples of his work far inferior to those great Epinician Odes that have made the Theban eagle famous through the ages. Of Herondas it may be said that if his writings were again lost, Greek literature would not be much the poorer. The verdict of men of culture, arrived at in the long lapse of time, has been profoundly just. Not only is it the truly great writers—Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Pindar, Herodotus, Thucydides—that have come down to us, but the best productions of these authors, as is clearly seen in the case of the recently discovered fragments of Pindar.

But even those who stood at the birth of the New Menander were not unduly enthusiastic, and in one of the earliest appreciations which one finds in the Bodin-Mazon *Extraits d'Aristophane et de Ménandre* the estimate is remarkable for its balance in view of the newness of the discovery. In fact, for real enthusiasm we have to look to Professor SHOWERMAN'S review of Professor CAPPS' edition of *Four Plays of Menander* (Ginn), a memorable work for which all Greek scholars are duly grateful. In the wake of this achievement we shall doubtless have a number of dissertations dealing with various sides of the poet's language and art, and I myself have been guilty of suggesting a study of Menander's use of the perfect tense (A. J. P. XXIX 390). There is enough of Menander to begin the business of tabulating his usage, if it were only to prove by figures the correctness of early impressions. Wilamowitz is emphatic as to the normality of Menander's verse. Menander, he says, is as correct as Aristophanes, and what Menander is in his verse, he is elsewhere, and by his *Studies in Menander* (Bryn Mawr, The Author, \$1) Dr. F. WARREN WRIGHT has amply confirmed the impression of conventionality. The chapter of Oaths in Menander with its portentous array of literature brings us to the expected result, that 'the characters in Menander used the oaths generally used in other Greek comedies and presumably by the mass of the people', with the droll inference, 'the oaths in Menander, therefore, furnish additional evidence that his language was closely imitative of the language of the common people'. The presumption of the first sentence becomes the proof of the second. In Menander as elsewhere the oath by Zeus is the most common and the least significant. In later Greek it is often

found as one word without the compliment of a capital letter; and there is not the slightest use in trying to find out any special propriety in an oath that is as wide as heaven itself. Of course, when epithets are used, the case is different. The assignment of oaths according to the sexes is familiar from Aristophanes who makes a point of it, but the attempt to find a special propriety in every oath is doomed to failure. In the last analysis the special propriety oath is a manner of Bob Acres oath of which Aristophanes sets the pattern in the *Birds*, *μὰ παγίδας, μὰ νεφέλας, μὰ δίκτυα*; but such exactness is not compatible with the excitement of the situation that elicits the oath, to say nothing of the verse. Chaucer is careful to tell us how daintily the prioress swore, but I venture to say that the oaths in Shakespeare would defy any such analysis as Dr. WRIGHT has applied to the oaths in Menander. Neil's suggestion that the oath by Poseidon is the oath of the conservative is seductive, especially in view of the aristocratic character of names in *-ιππος*, but Dr. WRIGHT has relegated that observation to a footnote. 'Young men', he says, 'swore by Poseidon only for special reasons; but with old men the oath was almost a commonplace. Women never swore by Poseidon', but women's swearing range is limited at any rate. In reading Lucian it has seemed to me that he is more prone to special propriety oaths than native writers, but I have long since learned to distrust impressions. But comment on the details of this part of the study would carry me beyond the bounds of *Brief Mention*.

The second chapter deals with quantity by position before mutes and liquids in the iambic trimeters and trochaic tetrameters of Menander. The general subject has an enormous literature, but the main facts are familiar. *γμ, γν, δμ, δν* always make position; *βλ* and *γλ* regularly do, in Aristophanes always. The remaining combinations, which constitute the vast majority, have as a rule no effect upon the quantity of a preceding short syllable. When Aristophanes says *κᾶπνίου* (*Vesp.* 251) we know that he is jesting. This difference between Attic and Epic is very interesting to the student of Pindar because it has been shown that in the lighter logaoedic measures Pindar inclines to the Attic norm, in the graver dactylo-epitrites to the Epic norm (*A. J. P.* XIII 385; XXVII 381). What has become of this pretty distinction in the recent upturning of Greek metres, I prefer not to inquire (*A. J. P.* XXXI 126). Suffice it for the present purpose to say that Dr. WRIGHT has after detailed discussion reached the conclusion, for which Wilamowitz had prepared us, 'Menander's prosodic treatment of syllables before a mute and liquid was not a whit different from that of Aristophanes'. And the conclusion of the third chapter On the Omission of the Article shows that the faithful lover of Glykera

was faithful here also, faithful at least in human measure, and 'sparingly', probably never directly contravened the usage of prose by omitting the article for the sake of his verse. Really the normality of Menander is almost oppressive, and he ought to have lived to a good old age instead of losing his life at an early age by yielding to the 'placidi pellacia ponti'. The fourth chapter of Dr. WRIGHT's dissertation deals with Asyndeton, which Demetrius Phalereus tells us is a characteristic of Menander (A. J. P. XXIX 327). Asyndeton is so natural to us that we have to acquire the feeling for it in Greek and learn to miss the hooks and eyes of the Greek sentence. English writers are capable of reeling off yards of narrative without a conjunction. The latest fad in French literature, Marie-Claire, abounds in ἀσύνδετον and ὀρθότης, both marks to a Greek of inartificiality—real or mock. Of course, extremes meet, and the elevated style of Pindar abounds so much in asyndeton that Dissen has written a special excursus on the subject, which I do not intend to do. Dr. WRIGHT's conclusion is that the poet used asyndeton so freely in order that as a playwright he might enliven his verse and make it more appropriate to the dramatic style. It is always a pleasure to have impressions confirmed, and if there is no surprise in Dr. WRIGHT's dissertation, the work was worth doing.

In the last number of the Journal Professor RAND has referred to the admirable study of the Five Ages of Hesiod, contained in the *Genethliakon* dedicated to Carl Robert on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday (Berlin, Weidmann), in which EDUARD MEYER has brought the personality of the poet of Askra much nearer to us, though, to be sure, Hesiod never dwelt apart from everyday humanity. Of especial interest to me in view of earlier studies is the footnote (p. 103) in which Professor MEYER traces the history of Hesiod's married life; how in his poverty-stricken youth he was sadly plagued by his Xanthippe, but how as he grew old and had gathered gear and his wife cared less for dress, he seems to have been on more comfortable terms with his other half, though he never shews the same resigned spirit as Sokrates, and breaks out every now and then in drastic expressions. But Sokrates never wavered in his belief in Xanthippe's fidelity, whereas I, for one, cannot suppress the suspicion of a sinister meaning in the famous line

τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες ἰοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσιν,

as well as in v. 166

οὐδὲ πατὴρ παίδεσσιν ὁμοῖος οὐδέ τι παῖδες.

There may have been a 'sport' among the children of the couple in whose conjugal relations Professor MEYER has shewn and

roused such interest. And if we are to press modern biographical analogies, it was to such a 'sport' that Stesichoros owed his parentage.

There are other papers in the *Genethliakon* besides EDUARD MEYER's that deserve longer notice than can be accorded to them in *Brief Mention*. Of the *Three Chapters of Elean History* the most interesting for the student of Pindar is the third, in which BENEDICTUS NIESE maintains that there was no such independent community as Pisatis until 365 and 364 B. C. when the Arcadians cut off a part of Elis under that name and incorporated it into the Arcadian League. Busolt is right, Swoboda and Frazer wrong. There never was such a *πόλις* as Pisa. Pisa was originally the name of the territory in which Olympia lay and became simply the equivalent—poetical or other of Olympia. It was just a part of Elis and the later history of the district was merely projected into the earlier. A similar projection is to be found in WISSOWA's *Naevius and the Metelli*. The familiar 'model' Saturnian 'Malum dabunt Metelli Naevio poetae' was manufactured by Caesius Bassus in the time of Nero, a droll model at best, inasmuch as it has no real fellow in our store of genuine Saturnians. The verse to which it is supposed to be a retort, 'Fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules' is no Saturnian at all but simply an old-fashioned senarius, and Zumpt was right when he maintained many years ago that in the time of Naevius the Metelli had not begun to play so conspicuous a part in the official life of Rome as the squib implies. Far different was the case two or three generations after Naevius when there were consuls out of the Metellus family enough and to spare; when in the space of some twenty years six consulships, four censorships and five triumphs fell to the lot of six descendants of the Metelli of Naevius' time. Indeed, it has been suggested that the saying, 'Fato Metelli', was made up by some grammarian who had nothing better to do, out of the words of Cicero who first alludes to the fatality of the Metellan consulship, but Wissowa rejects this hypothesis. It was one of those jokes that passed from mouth to mouth among the Roman populace and the response to it was fashioned by the grammarian already mentioned, and the whole thing foisted upon Naevius and the Metelli of his time. And so one of the most famous sayings in the history of Roman literature is sent to keep company with other famous sayings, the saying of Cambronne at the battle of Waterloo and the saying attributed to the Comte d'Artois, the future Charles X, when he reëntered Paris.

Another Pindaric note, which may serve as a stopgap. I have long wanted to know who first interpreted Pindar's *λοστέφανοι Ἀθῆναι* as a reference to the amethystine hues of the garland

of mountains that encompasses Athens, as I phrased it in *Hellas and Hesperia* (p. 40), and otherwise elsewhere. In an article on *Aristophanes and Nature* written à propos of Rostand's Chantecler and published in the *Revue de Paris* for October, 1910, M. PAUL GIRARD attributes the interpretation to the historian Paparrhigopoulos 'homme de grande valeur', and, like all the Greeks I have ever known, a passionate lover of his country, and then the author goes on to say that Aristophanes would have laughed at the 'patriotique contresens'. Perhaps so, but Aristophanes would have laughed also at M. GIRARD's misinterpretation of Ach. 635, where the ὑμᾶς does not mean the Athenians themselves as is evident from the two other passages in which Aristophanes quotes Pindar's λουτέφανοι Ἀθῆναι Eq. 1323 and 1329, nay, as is evident from the context of the passage in the Acharnians

εἰ δέ τις ὑμᾶς ὑποθωπεύσας λιπαρὰς καλέσειεν Ἀθῆνας
εὖρετο πᾶν δὲ διὰ τὰς λιπαράς.

It is to me inconceivable that the Athenians should have sat up in ecstasy at being told that they were in the habit of wearing what M. GIRARD calls their pet flower; and if Aristophanes thought of the fragrant violets—were they our violets?—that perfumed the fields of Athmonon and furnished forth the favorite wreaths of the Athenians, the Pindaric scholar has a right to read his λουτέφανοι Ἀθῆναι by the mystic light of the Sixth Olympian—τοῦτ' ὄνυμ' ἀθάνατον—if not by the violet hues of the mountains that I gazed on with swelling heart fifteen years ago as I was leaving Athens doubtless forever and sailing on the watery paths that lead to Byzantium. But, if I remember aright, Ernst Curtius saw in λουτέφανοι a reference to the Ionian kinship of Athens. No interpreter possesses an achromatic lens.

Out of the mass of examples in Professor R. B. STEELE's *Conditional Sentences in Livy* (Leipzig, R. Brockhaus) I gather one or two things that I am inclined to emphasize. Nothing could prove more distinctly the perverseness of comparing the Latin present subjunctive with the Greek subjunctive in conditional relations than the extreme rarity of *si* with the present subjunctive in the protasis and the future indicative in the apodosis for which STEELE cites only four examples, all the subjunctives being translatable by the Greek optative. In like manner *ac si* with the present subjunctive corresponds to ὥσπερ εἰ with the optative, as I have urged before (A. J. P. XXII 65; XXV 481; XXX 11). In summing up the author remarks that in Livy 'the unreal conditions are far more numerous than the ideal, a fact incidental to the general character of the work', and thus makes a point too often overlooked by writers on statistical syntax.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Aristotle. *Aristotelis de arte poetica liber*; recognovit I. Bywater; editio altera. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1911. 8 + 48 pp. 12° (Oxford classical texts), 50 c.

Aristophanes. *The Clouds*; Prose translation, critical notes and commentary by W. J. M. Starkie. New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 88 + 369 pp. 8°, \$4 net.

Botsford (G. W.) *A history of the ancient world*. New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 18 + 588 pp. maps, il. 8°, \$1.50 net.

Ciceronis orationes; *Cum senatui gratias egit*, etc.; recognovit Guillelmus Peterson. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1911. 12° (Oxford classical texts), 75 c.

— *Pro Tullio*, etc.; recognovit Albertus C. Clark. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1911. 12° (Oxford classical texts), 60 c.

Crittenden (A. R.) *The sentence structure of Virgil*. Ann Arbor, Mich., *University of Michigan*, 1911. 72 pp. 8°, 50 c.

Ferriman (Z. D.) *Greece and the Greeks*. New York, *Pott*, 1911. 338 pp. pls. 8°, \$3 net.

Fowler (W. W.) *The religious experience of the Roman people*. Gifford lectures. New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 18 + 504 pp. 8°, \$4 net.

Head (B. V.) and others. *Historia numorum*; a manual of Greek numismatics. New and enl. ed. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1911. 31 + 966 pp. (10 pp. bibl.) il. tabs. 8°, \$12.75.

Holmes (T. R. E.) *Cæsar's conquest of Gaul*. 2d ed., rev. throughout and largely rewritten. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1911. 39 + 872 pp. por. 12°, \$7.75.

Hunt (A. S.) *Catalogue of the Greek papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*. Vol. I. *Literary texts No. 1-16*. London, 1911. 8°, 12s. net.

Kelsey (F. W.) ed. *Latin and Greek in American Education*. New York, *Macmillan*. 10 + 396 pp. 8° (University of Michigan studies, Humanistic ser.), \$1.50 net.

Murray (G.) *The rise of the Greek epic*; 2d ed., rev. and enl. New York, *Oxford University*, 1911. 368 pp. 8°, \$1.50.

Sophocles. *Antigone*; tr. into English verse by Jos. E. Harry. Cincinnati, *R. Clarke Co.*, 1911. 60 pp. 8°, \$1 net.

Spagnolo (Baptista) [Called Mantuanus]. The eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus; ed., with introd. and notes, by Wilfred P. Mustard. Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*, 1911. 156 pp. 8°, \$1.50.

Taciti Opera omnia. Recognovit C. D. Fisher. London, 1911. 8°, 15s.

FRENCH.

Daremberg (Ch.) et Saglio. Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines. T. IV, 2^e partie (R.-S.), grav., in-4°. *Hachette et C^{ie}*. 25 fr.

Hovelacque (A.) La linguistique, histoire naturelle du langage. in-8°. *Schleicher frères*. br., 1 fr. 95; cart., 2 fr. 45.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. Hrsg. v. Rich. Förster. gr. 8°. Breslau, *M. & H. Marcus*. 48. Heft. Hauck (Max). De hymnorum Orphicorum aetate. (68 S.) 1911. 2.40.

Belzner (E.) Homerische Probleme. I. Die kulturellen Verhältnisse der Odyssee als krit. Instanz. Mit e. Nachwort (Aristarchea) v. A. Roemer. (vi, 202 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 5.

Cicero. Paradoxa stolcorum. Academicorum reliquiae cum Lucullo. Timaens. De natura deorum. De divinatione. De fato. Ed. Otto Plasberg. Fasc. II. (IV u. S. 197-399.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 8; geb. 9.

Crusius (Otto). Wie studiert man klassische Philologie? Ein Vortrag. (58 S.) 8°. München, *E. Reinhardt*, 1911. .60.

Dietrich (Rud.) Collectanea zu Artemidorus Daldianus. 8°. Rudolstadt, *Müller*. 3. 4. 5. 7. Tl. (27 S.) (Tl. 6 ist noch nicht erschienen.)

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. XIX. gr. 8°. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. Pars 4. Gross (Otto). De metonymiis sermonis latini a deorum nominibus petitis. (S. 296-410.) 1911. 3.

Ebeling (Heinr.) Schulwörterb. zu Homers Odyssee u. Illas. 7. verb. Aufl. (iv, 263 S.) gr. 8°. Hannover, *Hahn*. 1.80.

Erbe, Das, der Alten. Schriften üb. Wesen u. Wirkg. der Antike, gesammelt u. hrsg. v. O. Crusius, O. Immisch, Th. Zielinski. Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich*. 2. u. 3. Heft. Süss (Wilh.) Aristophanes u. die Nachwelt. 1. u. 2. Aufl. (ix, 226 S.) 4; geb. 5.

Foerster (Rich.) Das Erbe der Antike. Festreden. (vii, 114 S.) Lex. 8°. Breslau, *Koebner*, 1911. 3.

Galenı Pergameni de atticissantium studiis testimonia. Collegit Herbst. (166 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 6.

Gruhn (Alb.) Der Schauplatz der Illas u. Odyssee. Lex. 8°. Friedrichshagen-Berlin (Westend 5), *Selbstverlag*. 11. Heft. Von den Sirenen bis Ogygia. Die Inseln der Irrfahrt. (179 S.) 1911. 5.50. Heft 4, 7 u. 8 sind noch nicht erschienen.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller. Lex. 8°. München, *C. H. Beck*. IV. Bd. 2. Abtlg. II. Tl. Blümner (Hugo). Die römischen Privataltertümer. (xi, 677 S. m. 86

Abbildgn.) 1911. 12; geb. in Halbfz. n 14. VII. Bd. Christ (Wilh. v.) Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur. 5. Aufl., unter Mitwirkg. v. O. Stählin bearb. v. W. Schmid. 2. Tl.: Nachklassische Periode der griech. Litteratur. I. Hälfte: Von 320 vor Christus bis 100 nach Christus. 2. Lfg. (VIII u. S. 235-506.) 1911. 4.50. VIII. Bd., 2. Abtlg., I. Hälfte. Schanz (Mart.) Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis auf Justinian. 2. Tl.: Die röm. Litteratur bis auf Hadrian. I. Hälfte: Die augustische Zeit. 3., ganz umgearb. u. stark verm. Aufl. mit Register. (xii, 604 S.) 1911. 10; geb. in Halbfz. n 12.

Homer's Gedichte. 2. Tl.; Die Ilias. Bearb. v. Osk. Henke. Text. 1. Bd.: Buch 1-18. 4. Aufl. (iv, 295 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. geb. in Halbleinw. 2.

Hönn (Karl). Quellenuntersuchungen zu den Viten des Heliogabalus u. des Severus Alexander. (vi, 252 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 8; geb. in Leinw. 9.

Horatius; Satiren u. Episteln. Für den Schulgebr. erklärt v. G. T. A. Krüger. 1. Bdchn. Satiren. 16. Aufl., besorgt v. Gust. Krüger. (xiii, 224 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911.

Jahresbericht üb. die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, begründet v. Conr. Bursian, hrsg. v. W. Kroll. gr. 8°. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland*. Suppl.-Bd. 151. Bd. Klussmann (Rud.) Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum et graecorum et latinorum. Die Literatur von 1878-1896 einschliesslich umfassend. I. Bd.: Scriptores graeci. 2. Tl.: Hybrias bis Zosimus. (450 S.) 1911. 11; Einzelpr. 12.

Leyen (Frdr. v. der). Wie studiert man deutsche Philologie? (Vortrag). (24 S.) 8°. München, *E. Reinhardt*, 1911. .60.

Libanii Opera. Recensuit Rich. Foerster. Vol. VI. Declamationes XIII-XXX. (iv, 66 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 14; geb. 14.80.

Lillge (F.) Komposition u. poetische Technik der *Διομήδους 'Αριστεία*. (vi, 116 S.) 8°. Gotha, *Fr. A. Perthes*, 1911. 2.

Lodge (Gonzales). Lexicon Plantinum. Vol. I fasc. VI. (S. 481-576.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 7.20.

Maraghiannis (G.) Antiquités crétoises. II. série. Texte de G. Karo. (50 Taf. in Phototyp. m. XVII S. Text.) 25 x 33 cm. Candie (Kreta). Athen, *Eleftheroudakis & Barth*, 1911. geb. in Leinw. nn 24.

Methner (Rud.) Bedeutung u. Gebrauch des Konjunktivs in Relativsätzen u. Sätzen m. cum. (vii, 140 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1911. 3.

Ovidi Nasonis (P.) Amorum libri tres. Erklärt v. P. Brandt. (239 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich*, 1911. 7; geb. 9.

Platonis politia. Liber I. Für den Schulgeb. erklärt v. Waldem. Olsen. (iv, 78 S.) 8°. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*, 1911. 1.

Σοφοκλέους δράματα τὰ σωζόμενα ἐξ ἐρμηνείας καὶ διορθώσεως Πέτρου Νικ. Παπαγεωργίου. Tom. I. 'Ηλέκτρα. (cccxxv, 547 S.) Lex. 8°. Athen, 1911. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 10.

Sophokles' König Oidipus. Geo. Kern. 4. Aufl., bes. v. Frdr. Paetzolt. (viii, 65 u. 71 S.) 8°. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*, 1910. 1.50.

Trendelenburg (Adf.) Pausanias' Hellenika. Progr. (29 S.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1911. 1.

Untersuchungen, Philologische, hrg. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 20. Heft. Malten (Ludf.) Kyrene. Sagengeschichtliche u. histor. Untersuchgn. (xiii, 222 S.) 1911. 8.

Vahlen (Johs.) Gesammelte philologische Schriften. 1. Tl. Schriften der Wiener Zeit 1858-1874. (vii, 658 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 14; geb. in Halbfrz. 16.50.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulr. v.) Über die Wespen des Aristophanes. (I.) (S. 460-491.) (II.) (S. 504-535.) Aus: "Sitzgsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss." Lex. 8°. Berlin, *G. Reimer*, 1911.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi utgivet genom Axel Kock. 28. Bandet. Ny Följa, 24. Bandet, Häftet 1. Lund, *C. W. K. Gleerup*, 1911.

Armstrong (Edward C.) The French Shifts in Adjective Positions and their English Equivalents. (Studies in Honor of A. Marshall Elliott.)

Arnold (E. Vernon). Roman Stoicism. Being Lectures on the History of the Stoic Philosophy with Special Reference to the Development within the Roman Empire. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1911. 10s. 6d.

ΑΘΗΝΑ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Τόμος 23. Τεύχος 1 καὶ 2. Ἀθήνησιν, Ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου Π. Δ. Σακελλαρίου, 1911.

Austin (Herbert D.) The Origin and Greek Version of the Strange-Feathers Fable. Reprint from Studies in Honor of A. M. Elliott. Vol. I. Baltimore, 1911.

Behaghel (Otto). Geschichte der deutschen Sprache (Grundriss der germanischen Philologie). Herausg. von H. Paul. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1911. 6 m.

Bericht over den Wedstrijd in Latijnsche Poëzie van het Jaar 1910. Amsterdam, *Johannes Müller*, 1911.

Brandt (Paul). P. Ovidi Nasonis Amorum Libri Tres. Erklärt von Paul Brandt. Leipzig, *Dieterich (Theodor Meichen)*, 1911. 9 m.

Bréal. Estudio crítico por el Dr. Juan M. Dihigo. Publicado en la Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Habana, *Imprenta Avisador Comercial*, 1911.

Bruce (J. D.) The Alphabet of Tales. No. 135 (Tales of the Fetid Breath). Sonderabdruck aus dem Archiv für d. Studium der neueren Sprachen. Bd. CXXVI. Heft 1/2. 1911.

Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii Carmina quae extant omnia cura Robinson Ellis, Joannis P. Postgate, Joannis S. Phillimore. Londini, *apud P. H. Lee Warner*, MDCCCXI. £1, 1s.

Certamen Poeticum Hoenftianum. Fanum Vacunae. Carmen praemio aureo ornatum. Accedunt quatuor carmina laudata. Amstelodami, *apud Io. Mullerum*, MCMXI.

XAPITEΣ. Friedrich Leo zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1911. 16m.

Christ, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. 5. Aufl. unter Mitwirkung von O. Stählin von Wilhelm Schmidt. Zweiter Teil. Die Nachklassische Periode. I. Hälfte. Zweite Lfg. München, *Oskar Beck*, 1911. 4 m. 50 pf.

Ciceros Rede für T. Annii Milo mit dem Kommentar des Asconius und den Bobienser Scholien. Herausgegeben von Dr. Paul Wessner. Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber's Verlag*, 1911. 1.60, Geb. 2. — m.

Clarke (M. G.) Sidelights on Teutonic History during the Migration Period: Girton College Studies No. 3. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1911.

Collitz (Klara Hechtenberg). Accentuation of Prefixes in English. Sonder-Abdruck, Englische Studien. 48. Band. 2. Heft.

Companion to Latin Studies (A). Edited for the Syndics of the University Press by John Edwin Sandys. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1910. 18s.

Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English (The) Adapted by H. W. and F. G. Fowler from The Oxford Dictionary. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1911.

Cory (Herbert E.) The Critics of Edmund Spenser. (Univ. of Cal. Publications in Mod. Philol. Vol. 2, No. 2.) Berkeley, *The University Press*, 1911.

Drake (A. M.) Selected and Supplementary Discoveries showing Aryo-Semitic Cognation. Denver, *The Herrick Co.* London, *Regan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.*, 1911.

Eastern-Western Review. May, June, July, and August, 1911. Boston, *I. I. Timayenis*, @ 10c.

Elderkin (G. W.) Tholos and Abaton at Epidauros. (Reprint from Am. Jour. Archaeol., Second Series, Vol. XV (1911), No. 2.)

Ellis (Robinson). The Tenth Declamation of (Pseudo-) Quintilian. A Lecture. London, *Henry Frowde*, 1911. 1s. net.

Fraccaroli (Giuseppe): Constantin Ritter. Note critiche ai Persiani di Timoteo. (Estratti della Rivista di Filologia Classica. Luglio, 1910. Aprile, 1911.)

Fulda, Der Talisman. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, Questions, and Vocabulary, by Otto Manthey-Zorn. 16 mo, xxiii + 239 pages, with frontispiece. Boston, *Ginn and Company*, 1911. 45 c.

Garnett (James Mercer). Biographical Sketch of Hon. Charles Fenton Mercer. Privately printed by Whittet and Shepperson. Richmond, Va. 1911.

Gudeman (A.) Grammatik. Sonderabdruck (nicht im Handel) aus Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Stuttgart, *J. B. Metzlersche Buchhandlung*.

Hamilton (George L.) Dante in English Literature from Chaucer to Cary. (Reprinted from the Romanic Review, Vol. II, No. 2.)

Hempl (George). Early Etruscan Inscriptions. Fabretti 2343-2346. (Reprinted from the Matzke Memorial Volume.) Stanford University, *The University Press*, 1911.

Hermes. Herausg. von Friedrich Leo und Carl Robert. 46. Bd. 3. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchh.*, 1911.

Hoskier (H. C.) Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament, 2 vols. London, *B. Quaritch*, 1910 and 1911. 12s. net.

Johnson (A. C.) A Comparative Study in Selected Chapters in the Syntax of Isaeus, Isocrates and the Attic Psephismata preceding 300 B. C. (J. H. U. Diss.) Athens, *Printing Office "Hestia"*, 1911.

Jones (William), Algonquian (Fox). An Illustrated Sketch. Revised by Truman Michelson. Extract from Handbook of American-Indian Languages. Bulletin 40. Part 1. Bureau of American Ethnology (Boas). *Washington Government Printing Office*, 1911.

Jordan (Hermann). Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Leipzig, *Verlag von Quelle u. Meyer*, 1911. Geh. 16m., geb. 17m.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. XXXI. Part I. 1911. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, \$1.

Keep (Winthrop L.) *The Separation of the Attributive Adjective from its Substantive in Plautus*. (Univ. of California Publications in Class. Philol., Vol. 2, No. 7.) Berkeley, *The University Press*, 1911.

Kirtland (J. C.) *The Consequents of the Commission's Report*. (Reprint from the *Classical Journal*, Vol. VI, No. 8, May, 1911.

Kornitzer (Alois). *Lateinisches Übungsbuch für Obergymnasien*. 2te Ausg. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig *G. Freytag*, 1910. geb. 2 m.

Kurrelmeyer (W.) *Die Doppeldrucke von Goethes Werken*. Reprinted from *Modern Language Notes*, May, 1911.

Lamberton (Clark D.) *Themes from St. John's Gospel in Early Roman Catacomb Painting*. Princeton Ph. D. Diss.

Lateinisches Lesebuch für Realanstalten. Bearb. v. Christian Harder. II. Teil: Anmerkungen. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. 1 m. 20 pf.

Latin and Greek in American Education. Edited by Francis W. Kelsey. University of Michigan Publications. Humanistic Papers. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1911.

Lowe (W. H.) *Russian Roots and Compounds*. Cambridge, *University Press*, 1911.

Marx (Friedrich). *Naeulus*. (Abdruck aus den Berichten der phil.-hist. Klasse der Königl. Sächs. Ges. der Wiss. zu Leipzig. Band LXIII. Sitzung vom 29. April 1911.)

Μελέτη (H). *Μηνιαῖον δημοσίευμα*. Τεύχος 3ον, 4ον, 5ον, καὶ 6ον. Μάρτιος, Ἀπρίλιος, Μάιος, Ἰούνιος-Ἰούλιος, 1911. ἐν Ἀθήναις @ 1 δρ.

Memory in Art, The Training of, and the Education of the Artist by Lecoq de Boisbaudran. Transl. from the French by L. D. Luard. With an Introduction by Selwyn Image. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1911. \$2.

Merrill (William A.) *Studies in the Text of Lucretius*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 2, No. 6.) Berkeley, *The University Press*, 1911.

Métrique Sacrée des Grecs et des Romains. Par E. Cézard. Paris, *Librairie C. Klincksieck*, 1911. 8 fr.

Mosiman (Eddison). *Das Zungenreden geschichtlich u. psychologisch untersucht*. Tübingen, *J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)*, 1911. 4 m. 50.

Muséon (Le). *Études Philologiques, Historiques et Religieuses*. Publié par Ph. Colinet et L. De La Vallée Poussin. Nouvelle Série. Vol. XII. No. 1. Louvain, *J.-B. Istas*, 1911.

Mustard (W. P.) *The Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus*. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1911. \$1.50.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. Jo. Ilberg u. Bernh. Gerth. Vierzehnter Jahrg. XXVII. u. XXVIII. Bandes 4. 5. 6. u. 7. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Nr. 1/2. Helsingfors, 1911.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray. TEAM-TEZKERE (Vol. IX). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, July 1, 1911. Double Section (\$1.25).

Papyri Graecae Berolinenses. Collegit Wilhelm Schubart. (Tabulae in usum scholarum editae sub eura Iohannis Lietzmann, II.) Bonnae, A. Marcus et E. Weber, 1911. 6m.

Paxson (Susan). Two Latin Plays. 12 mo, cloth, xii + 89 pages. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1911. 45 c.

Philologische Untersuchungen herausg. von A. Kießling und U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 20. Heft. Kyrene. Sagen- und geschichtliche Untersuchungen von Ludolf Malten. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1911. 8m.

Pichon (J. E.) Leçons Pratiques de Vocabulaire, de Syntaxe et de Lecture littéraire. Freiburg (Baden), J. Bielefelds Verlag, 1911. m. 3.50.

Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. Vol. XXXIII. Part 5. London, The Offices of the Society, 1911.

Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904, 1905 and 1909. Division II: Ancient Architecture in Syria. By Howard Crosby Butler. Division III. Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Syria. By Eno Littmann, David Magic, Jr., and Duane Reed Stuart. Sedin A: Southern Syria. Part 2. Southern Haanan. *Late E. J. Brill.* Leyden, 1910. m. 23.50.

Rand (E. K.) Horatian Urbanity in Hesiod's Works and Days. (Reprint from American Journal of Philology, Vol. XXXII, 2.

— Review of *Index Verborum Vergilianus* by Monroe Nichols Wetmore. (Reprinted from Classical Philology, Vol. VI, No. 3, July, 1911.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XII. Num. 2 y 3. *Imprenta "Avisador Comercial"*, 1911.

Revue Celtique. Dirigée par J. Loth. Vol. XXXII, No. 2. Paris, Librairie Honoré Champion, 1911.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von August Brinkmann. N. F. 66. Bandes 2. u. 3. Heft. Frankfurt a. M., J. D. Sauerländer's Verlag, 1911.

Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica. Direttore Ettore Stampini. Anno XXXIX, Fasc. 3°. Torino, *Ermanne Loescher*, 1911.

Robertson (A. T.) Kurzgefasste Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Deutsche Ausg. von Hermann Stock. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1911. 5 m.

Römische Komödien deutsch von C. Bardt. III. Bd. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1911. 5m.

Saylor (Charles H.) A Comparative Scheme of the Moods and Tenses of Cicero's Translations from the Greek. J. H. U. Diss. Baltimore, J. H. Furst Co., 1911.

Scriptor Latinus. Menstruus Commentarius. Annus VIII. Num. IX. Francofurti ad Moenum, 1911. m. 4.25 per ann.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Aristotelis De Arte Poetica Liber. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit I. Bywater. Editio altera. Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano, MCMXI. 2s.

Skeat (W. W.) English Dialects from the Eighth Century to the Present Day. Cambridge, At the University Press. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. 40c.

Snedeker (Caroline D.) The Coward of Thermopylae. New York, Doubleday, Page & Co., 1911.

Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 43. Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley and Adjacent Coast of the Gulf of Mexico, by John R. Swanton. Bulletin 44. Indian Languages of Mexico and Central America and their Geographical Distribution, by Cyrus Thomas and John R. Swanton. Bulletin 50. Preliminary Report of a Visit to the Navaho National Monument, Arizona, by J. W. Fewkes. Bulletin 51. Antiquities of the Mesa Verde National Park Cliff Palace, by J. W. Fewkes. *Washington Government Printing Office*, 1911.

Steele (R. B.) Case Usage in Livy. II. The Dative. Leipzig, *F. A. Brockhaus*, 1911.

Studies in Philology. Vol. VII. Howe (George). Nature Similes in Catullus. Bain (Charles W.) On *ὅπως* and *ὅπως ἄν*. Vol. VIII. Royster (James Finch). A Middle English Treatise on the Ten Commandments, edited with notes and an introduction. Part II. Introduction. Chapel Hill, N. C., *The University Press*, 1911.

Ullman (B. L.) The Manuscripts of Propertius. (Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vol. VI, No. 3.) Chicago, *Univ. of Chicago Press*, 1911.

Valentini (R.) Circa l'unità di tradizione nelle Antologie Valeriane. (Estr. Riv. *Classici e neolatini*, n. 1, a. VII, 1911.) Aosta, *Tip. e Leg. Giuseppe Marguerettaz*, 1911.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (U. von). Über die Wespen des Aristophanes. I. II. Sitzungsberichte der königl. Preuss. Ak. d. Wissenschaften. Sitzung der phil. histor. Classe vom 20. April u. vom 4. Mai. XXI. XXIII. Berlin, *Georg Reimer*, 1911. je 1 m.

Woolley (R. M.) The Liturgy of the Primitive Church. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1910. 5s.

Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen. Herausg. von H. J. Müller. 65. Jahrg. Der Neuen Folge 45. Jahrg. Juni. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1911.

Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum und Deutsche Litteratur. Herausg. von Edward Schroeder und Gustav Roethe. 53. Bd. 2. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1911.

Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur herausgegeben von Dr. D. Behrens. Band XXXVIII. Heft 1. u. 3. Der Abhandlungen erstes und zweites Heft. Chemnitz u. Leipzig, *Verlag von Wilhelm Gronau*, 1911.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXII, 4.

WHOLE No. 128.

I.—THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PARODOI IN THE GREEK THEATER.

It is now an accepted principle among classical scholars to interpret evidence, especially such evidence as is found in late Greek and Roman writers on matters of a much earlier period, by reference to the existing remains and monuments of the period involved. Dörpfeld has cleared up many theatrical problems by his careful and thorough excavation of the theater of Dionysus, thus enabling him to distinguish the different periods in its history. On scenic questions also we are fortunate in having a number of plays of different types and periods, including, of course, tragedies and comedies of the classical period, specimens of the New Comedy in the recently discovered fragments of Menander and its Roman translations by Plautus and Terence. Hence it is possible to audit the accounts of late writers on scenic matters and to determine more nearly the particular period referred to.

The baffling, and possibly corrupt, passage of Pollux (iv, 126, 15) on the significance of the *πάροδοι* can be rationally interpreted only by considering it in connection with the existing Greek and Roman plays and theaters. Pollux is certainly endeavoring to describe a convention which was in vogue at some period. What he really had in mind may best be determined by ascertaining the requirements of the plays of that period to which his words seem most applicable. The passage runs thus: *τῶν μὲντοι παρόδων ἡ μὲν δεξιὰ ἀγρόθεν, ἡ ἐκ λιμένος, ἡ ἐκ πόλεως ἄγει· οἱ δὲ ἄλλαχόθεν πεζοὶ ἀφικνούμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἐτέραν εἰσίσαι.* A few lines above we find the following statement on the *περίακτοι*: *ἡ μὲν δεξιὰ (περίακτος)*

τὰ ἔξω πόλεως δηλοῦσα, ἡ δ' ἑτέρα, τὰ ἐκ πόλεως, μάλιστα τὰ ἐκ λιμένος. The *left* periaktos represents τὰ ἐκ πόλεως, μάλιστα τὰ ἐκ λιμένος; the *right* parodos leads ἐκ λιμένος, ἡ ἐκ πόλεως. Obviously there can be no doubt that the triangular prism¹ upon which were painted scenes representative of the city and harbor was actually on the same side as the parodos leading from the city and harbor. It is clear, then, that one of the passages is corrupt, or that the standpoint in the use of 'right' and 'left' in each is different. The latter view was first advanced by Buttmann,² who assumed that the periaktoi were placed at the side doors upon the stage and that 'right' and 'left' in reference to anything upon the stage as opposed to the orchestra were used from the actor's standpoint, while direction in the orchestra is described from the spectator's point of view. The 'left' (actor's) periaktos would thus be on the same side of the theater as the 'right' (spectator's) parodos. But this solution of the difficulty seems forced; it is hard to believe that Pollux would not have given us some hint of so sudden a change of standpoint. This consideration led Rohde,³ rightly I think, to emend the parodoi passage by substituting ἀριστερά for δεξιά. Thus 'right' and 'left' would be used in both passages from the actor's standpoint. This usage is also in line with a passage in the anonymous writer *De vita Aristophanis* (see Schol. Aristoph. ed. Dübner, p. 28, note): ὁ κωμικὸς χορὸς εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἤρχετο ἐπὶ τὸ θέατρον διὰ τῆς ἀριστερᾶς ἀψίδος εἰσέλκει, εἰ δ' ὡς ἀπ' ἀγροῦ διὰ τῆς δεξιᾶς.⁴ The point of view here is that of the actor, assuming, of course, that the ancient city was on the western side of the theater of Dionysus.

¹ The *περίακτοι* were not employed, apparently, in the production of plays in the fifth century B. C.; see Niejahr Quaest. Aristoph. Scaenicae, pp. 6 ff. No trace of them has been discovered in the ruins of any Greek theater. Significant, too, is the fact that Aristophanes, who is fond of parodying the stage machinery of his time, never alludes to them.

² See Rohde's Uebers. des Vitru. I, p. 280, note r. This view is now commonly accepted; cf. Schönborn Skene d. Hellenen, p. 73; Müller Bühnenalt., p. 159; Haigh Attic Theatre³, p. 194.

³ De Pollucis fontibus, p. 61.

⁴ Practically the same statement is found in Tzetzes De Com. (See Kaibel, Com. graec. frag., p. 29): ἂν οὖν ὡς ἐκ πόλεως ἐβάδιζε πρὸς τὸ θέατρον, διὰ τῆς ἀριστερᾶς ἀψίδος ἐβαινεῖν εἰ δ' ὡς ἀπ' ἀγροῦ, διὰ τῆς δεξιᾶς κ. τ. λ. Thus the Anon. passage is well attested, for Tzetzes claims as his source Dionysius, Crates, and Eucleides; see Kaibel Proleg. περὶ κωμῳδίας, p. 9 and Rohde, loc. cit., p. 60, n. 2.

It is clear, then, that Pollux uses 'right' and 'left' from the actor's standpoint. But before taking up the other details of the passage, it will facilitate our reaching a more satisfactory solution of its difficulties to recall the essential differences between theatrical conditions and scenic requirements of the classical drama and the New Comedy.

The materials with which the classical dramatists worked were such as to make a clearly defined localized setting out of place and unnecessary. Neither poet nor spectator was very much concerned about topographical details. The Trojan and Theban cycle of myths and other mythological subjects do not require exact definitions of the scene in its relation to the surrounding locality. The Athenian spectator was unacquainted with the regions in which the scenes of many of the classical tragedies were laid. Hence the poet was free to disregard topographical facts in scenic representation, and to leave details hazily defined. Aeschylus in the *Suppliants* leaves us to infer that the action takes place somewhere between the coast and Argos. The only requirements in the scenic arrangement of the *Prometheus* is a desolate spot on a Scythian crag in the neighborhood of the sea. The position of the immediate vicinity is in no way connected with the progress of the play. Even when the scene is a palace or a temple, we can, as a rule, only conjecture the position of the palace or temple in its relation to the city and country. Neither Euripides nor his Athenian audience knew or cared, for example, about the city and country in the *Iphigenia among the Taurians*. The temple of Artemis forms the background, and the seacoast is represented as being at no remote distance from the scene, whence Orestes and Pylades come. The poet does not mention the city, though we infer that Thoas comes from that quarter. Such details are passed over as have but an incidental bearing upon the plot of the play. Likewise, in the various camp scenes, the commander's tent forms the background, but we are not informed, usually, nor is it important, in what part of the camp his tent is located.¹

Several of the fifth century tragedies and comedies have their scenes laid at Athens, or in its environs. In these plays the poets and audience were familiar with the scenes represented, which were, doubtless, as realistic as the poets could make them.

¹ The *Ajax* is an exception; in this play scenic details are pretty clearly outlined. See Jebb on v. 1, and below, p. 387.

Sophocles is unquestionably giving us a real picture of the Grove of the Eumenides as the scenic background of the *Oedipus Coloneus* (see p. 390 below). Aristophanes lays the scenes of most of his plays at Athens, but he does not attempt to be consistently accurate, or realistic, in their scenic arrangement.¹ Local details do not play an important part in the working out of his plots. He was more concerned with scourging the politicians, or ridiculing the follies of his fellow-citizens, or parodying the stage devices of his tragic contemporaries. In his later plays, however, we first meet with the kind of a situation which probably led to the origin of the conventional use of the side entrances. For example, in the *Ecclesiazusae*, one of his latest comedies, the scene represents three houses upon a street in Athens. During vv. 30-54 many women enter from the city (see vv. 52-53: ὁρῶ προσιούσας καὶ ἐτέρας πολλὰς πάννυ | γυναῖκας, ὅτι πέρ ἐστ' ὄφελος ἐν τῇ πόλει. These women constitute a hemichorus and are contrasted with the second hemichorus of women who, as we may suppose, enter from the country (cf. v. 300: ὅρα δ' ὅπως ὠθήσομεν (i. e. we women from the country) τοῦσδε τοὺς ἐξ ἄστεως. See also vv. 280 ff. καὶ γὰρ ἐτέρας οἶομαι | ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν εἰς τὴν Πύκν' ἦξειν ἀντικρυς | γυναῖκας. Thus the women who come from the city form a part of the chorus, those from the country another part, and the hemichoruses should have entered upon the scene from the opposite sides. The location of the Dionysiac theater at Athens on the south slope of the Acropolis was such that a character coming from the city, marketplace, or harbor, would naturally enter on the spectator's right, while persons coming from the open country would enter on the left. It must be remembered that direction in the open air Greek theater was of far more importance than in the modern roofed theater, shut in from the outside world. In the latter the stage manager may utterly disregard direction. As soon as the audience enters the door, north, south, east, or west, has no especial significance; no attempt is made at orientation. But it would be absurd to allow a character coming from the Peiraeus, if the scene were laid at Athens, to enter by the left parodos. The audience would detect too quickly such a managerial blunder. Any character

¹ But in the *Lysistrata* the local setting seems to be carried out with a considerable degree of accuracy. Note what *Lysistrata* says (vv. 831 and 835) at the approach of Cinesias: ἀνδρ', ἀνδρ' ὁρῶ προσιόντα . . . παρὰ τὸ τῆς Χλόης. The temple of Chloe was at the foot of the Acropolis on the south.

that comes from the city, harbor, or marketplace should, as a matter of course, regardless of the existence of the convention, enter on the spectator's right; characters from the country should enter on the left.

The country, city, and marketplace, then, have no organic connection with the plots of the fifth century tragedies. They are but rarely and incidentally referred to. In the later plays of Aristophanes the city and country are felt to be on opposite sides, but it is doubtful whether any conventional use of the parodoi had as yet become established. The matter is quite different, however, in the drama of real everyday life, the drama of intrigue and of manners where familiar scenes are depicted. The city, country, marketplace, and foreign lands have a very especial bearing upon the development of the plots in the New Comedy. The Athenian citizen portrayed here possessed an estate in the country. Whenever the plot required the absence of the father or anyone else in the family for any length of time, this estate offered the poet a natural and convenient motive for his removal, or a pretext for his absence. The marketplace, on the other hand, was the center of Athenian life, a public walk, an exchange. The absence of any person from the scene could plausibly be explained on the assumption that he is in the marketplace. Characters, consequently, enter from the *agora* and retire thither on the slightest pretext when the action requires their removal from the scene. As to the harbor, almost any play of Plautus and Terence will show how closely it is connected with the development of the plots. Some leading character who lives at Athens is usually abroad. His return sometimes increases the complication of the plot, or helps toward its solution. Such characters on their return from abroad invariably travel by sea¹ and, on their arrival upon the scene, it is made clear in the text, usually by specific statement, that they have just come up from the harbor.

With these general observations in mind we are in a better position for solving some of the difficulties in the passage quoted from Pollux. The right parodos (spectator's), says Pollux, leads ἀγρόθεν, ἢ ἐκ λιμένος, ἢ ἐκ πόλεως. This statement does not harmonize with other ancient evidence on the subject, nor with the

¹See Knapp, *Travel in Plautus and Terence*, *Class. Phil.* II (1907), pp. 19 ff.

actual conditions in the New Comedy. The city and country in the theater at Athens were conceived as being on opposite sides, and the same parodos cannot be thought of as leading from both city and country. This point is made clear from the above quoted passage from the anonymous writer *De vita Aristophanis*: *εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἤρχετο . . . διὰ τῆς ἀριστερᾶς ἀψίδος εἰσῆι, εἰ δ' ὡς ἀπ' ἀγροῦ διὰ τῆς δεξιᾶς*. The text, then, as we find it in Pollux, can hardly be sound. Schönborn¹ sought to remove the difficulty by writing *ἀγορῆθεν* for *ἀγρόθεν*. This correction would bring the statement into closer harmony with the requirements in the New Comedy, though it is hard to believe that *ἀγρόθεν* does not belong to the passage in view of the usual contrast between *ἐκ πόλεως* and *ἀγρόθεν*. And yet reference to the *ἀγορά* is so frequent in the New Comedy that in any description of the convention the use of *ἀγορῆθεν*, or the equivalent, would not be irrelevant.² In a brief statement, however, an expression for the marketplace might be omitted, inasmuch as it would be included in *ἐκ πόλεως*. For this reason Rohde is justified, as it seems to me, in transposing *ἀγρόθεν* to the second clause. The passage in its emended form would read thus: *τῶν μέντοι παρόδων ἡ μὲν ἀριστερὰ ἢ ἐκ λιμένος ἢ ἐκ πόλεως ἄγει· οἱ δὲ ἀγρόθεν ἢ ἀλλαχόθεν πεζοὶ ἀφικνούμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἐτέραν εἰσίσσι*. In the opinion of the writer this is substantially what Pollux wrote. There still remains a serious difficulty in the phrase *πεζοὶ ἀφικνούμενοι*. If sound, it should be contrasted with *ἐκ λιμένος*. The meaning implied in such a contrast would seem to be that those who come from abroad (*ἀλλαχόθεν*) *on foot* enter from the country side, while those journeying from abroad *by sea* would come up from the harbor and enter from the city side. Now, in the New Comedy persons from abroad always journey by sea, never by land on foot.³ The words *πεζοὶ ἀλλαχόθεν ἀφικνούμενοι*, then, can have nothing to do with the production of plays in this period. It is not uncommon in the classical drama, however, for a character to come from a

¹ Skene *der Hellenen*, p. 74. Other attempts at improving this passage might be mentioned; Wieseler, *Gött. Prorect.-Progr.* (1866), p. 11, writes *ἀγρόθεν* for *ἀγρόθεν*; see also Wecklein, *Philologus*, XXXI, p. 447, and Müller, *Bühnenalt.*, p. 159, notes 1, 2, 3.

² Cf. *ἐκ τῆς [ἀγορᾶς]* Men. *Samia*, v. 66, and *e foro* in Plautus and Terence.

³ See Knapp (*Travel in Ancient Times*), *Class. Phil.* II (1907), pp. 13 ff. for illustrations. Furthermore, "in every passage containing reference to coming to Athens *peregre* the harbor (called Piræus or simply portus) is mentioned" (p. 13).

distance on foot. For example, Pylades in the *Orestes* comes on foot from Phocis. The conclusion seems probable that Pollux, or his source, has confused matters. Having in mind instances similar to the one just cited from the *Orestes*, he has sought to enlarge the scope of the convention, a convention which grew up in the later period, so as to include the classical plays too. Similarly, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that there is some confusion, or misunderstanding, at the base of Vitruvius' statement on the *periaktoi*, V, 6: *secundum ea loca versurae sunt procurentes, quae efficiunt una a foro, altera a peregre aditus in scenam*. These words admit of no satisfactory interpretation when considered in connection with the scenic requirements of the plays. Niejahr has demonstrated that the *periaktoi* had not yet come into use in the fifth century. And besides, no contrast between *e foro* and *peregre* is discernible in the plays of this period, as we shall attempt to point out later in this paper. Nor can the passage have any application to the production of plays in the New Comedy, unless *peregre* is used as an equivalent of *rure*; the forum and harbor (whence characters from abroad enter) are on the same side.¹ No satisfactory solution of the difficulty has been advanced.

Accepting the above corrections, Pollux's statement runs thus: The right (spectator's) parodos leads from the city, or harbor;² the left from the country, or from abroad by land (if such is the meaning of the doubtful phrase *οἱ δὲ ἀλλαχόθεν περὶ ἀφικνούμενοι*). The passage as thus emended, except the last phrase, fits perfectly the scenic requirements of the New Comedy.

Müller, on the other hand, retains the traditional text of Pollux.³ The three expressions *ἀγρόθεν*, *ἢ ἐκ λιμένος*, *ἢ ἐκ πόλεως* ergeben zusammen den Begriff der Heimath, insofern zur Heimath des Atheners nicht nur Stadt und Hafen, sondern auch das Landgebiet gehörte.⁴ Thus the right parodos leads from the home region, including country, harbor and city; the

¹ It is perfectly clear that the city and harbor are conceived as being on the same side in the *Rudens*. For further proof that forum and harbor are conceived as being on same side see *Amphitruo*, v. 333 and *Andria* IV, 3, 19.

² Of course, what Pollux says is that the left (actor's) parodos leads from the city, etc., but it has seemed best in this paper to describe direction from the spectator's standpoint in order to avoid any possible confusion.

³ Bühnenalt., p. 158.

⁴ Müller compares *Oed. Tyr.*, v. 112: *πότερα δ' ἐν οἰκοῖς ἢ 'ν ἀγροῖς ὁ Λαῖος ἢ γῆς ἐπ' ἄλλης τῷδε συμπίπτει φόνῳ*;

left parodos from foreign parts. Haigh¹ also, following the common interpretation as given by Müller, states the convention thus: "The entrance to the right of the audience was used by persons from the neighborhood; the entrance to the left by persons from a distance". The current theory that one entrance leads from abroad, the other from the home region, is adopted by most of the editors, since its application to a larger number of the classical plays is easier than any other. And yet, there is no uniformity in the interpretation of the rule. Some editors make the one parodos serve for those persons who come from the city, the other for persons coming from the country. This is necessarily the case when an attempt is made to apply the convention to those plays in which no foreign parts are involved. For example, in the *Antigone*, according to the editors and handbooks, the right parodos leads to the city, the left to the country, where the body of Polyneices lay, whither Antigone and the Guard go and return. So in the *Bacchae* only the city and open country are involved; no character comes from abroad, or departs thither. Now, as we have just observed, in the *Antigone* the left parodos represented the open country, although it too is in the immediate neighborhood; the right the city.² In the *Oedipus Tyrannus* the Old Servant of Laius comes from the open pastures. On which side should he enter? To be consistent with the application of our convention in the *Antigone*, he should enter on the left. But this side is reserved for persons coming from abroad, whence comes Creon, who arrives at v. 84 from Delphi, and the messenger from Corinth. It would be inappropriate for the Old Servant to enter from the city side. Schönborn leaves the difficulty with these words: Welche Thür es ist, durch die der Hirt des Laios auftritt, lässt sich wie gesagt nicht bestimmt angeben.³

It is now obvious that the requirements of individual plays vary with respect to the significance that may be attached to the parodoi. No one of the proposed interpretations of Pollux's definition of the convention can be made to fit all the plays. Hence editors, naturally, adopt that interpretation which comes nearest to meeting the demands of the particular play that they happen to be editing. Thus, in the endeavor to show that the conventional use of the side entrance did not exist in the classical

¹ Attic Theatre², p. 195.² Schönborn, p. 115.³ P. 121.

period, my task is somewhat complicated. It will be necessary to prove, not only that the distinction between the home region and foreign parts as applied to the fifth century plays will not hold, but also that the distinction between city, or home region, and country can not be consistently maintained. In chapters I, II, and III are presented the arguments and evidence which, in the writer's opinion, preclude the application of the rule to the classical tragedies and comedies; in chapter IV the attempt is made to show that a conventional use of the parodoi would have been both natural and appropriate for the New Comedy.

The thesis here proposed is not altogether a new one. Niejahr¹ was the first to question the existence of a side-entrance convention in the classical period. The reasons for reopening the subject again are: (1) His material was insufficient to establish a proof; his results were rejected by Müller.² (2) No edition of the plays, or handbook, so far as I know, has taken into account his treatise; it is either unknown or ignored. (3) Niejahr failed to make use of all the available material offered by the plays as evidence against the old theory. For these reasons it has seemed appropriate to subject the question to a fresh examination, both in order to bring the theory again to the attention of scholars, and to contribute whatever additional evidence there seems to be in favor of the theory.

I.

THE SCENES OF THE CLASSICAL DRAMAS ARE TOO DIVERSE FOR THE OPERATION OF THE ASSUMED CONVENTIONAL USE OF THE PARODOI.

The earliest plays of Aeschylus do not presuppose a palace or temple as a background. In the *Supplikes* we may suppose that the altar about which the Danaides cling was the background before which the scene of action was laid. There was no house to which the actors might retire, nor was there near by a city, or *agora*, or any other convenient retreat. The tomb of Darius serves for a backscene in the *Persae*. No house, or temple, is at hand in the *Prometheus*. Obviously, then, it would be absurd to attempt to apply a subtle conventional rule

¹ *Commentatio Scaenica Progr. des Stadtgymnasiums zu Halle, 1888.*

² *Philologus, Supp. Band VI (1891-1893), pp. 36 ff.*

on the use of the parodoi to these plays whose scenes scarcely imply any local setting at all. Aeschylus is absolutely unrestrained by tradition both as to form and as to scenic and theatrical machinery. He was an innovator. In his hands tragedy was ever changing and developing. Conventionality grows up, usually, in the decadent period after the perfection of a particular type has been reached, not in the changes and evolution toward that type. No conventionalized scene is discernible in Aeschylus' plays. Palace, temple, grave, tomb, or a desolate wilderness, make up the scenes. In Sophocles the local setting seems to be a little more clearly defined than in Aeschylus, though the diversity of scene is equally great. The scenes of the *Antigone*, *Electra*, and of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* are laid before a palace. The scenic background of the *Oedipus Coloneus* is the Sacred Grove of the Eumenides, of the *Ajax*, a tent in the Greek camp in Troad, and of the *Philoctetes* a desolate spot on Lemnos near the coast. The house of Heracles in Trachis forms the scenic background of the *Trachiniae*. The scene of action in most of Euripides' plays is laid before a palace, temple, or tent. Thus we fail to find a fixed, stereotyped back-scene in the plays of the classical tragedians. The diversity of locality and the variety of scenes, scenes which are laid in foreign lands, in camps, mountains, and on desolate sea coasts would not have been conducive to the development of a custom. Any custom, or convention, must necessarily be the result of a constant practice formed through similar surroundings and conditions, not of an arbitrary rule superimposed from without. The lack of uniformity in scene and locality of the classical plays would make the application of a fixed rule as to the parodoi confusing and inappropriate.

II.

EVIDENCE IN THE PLAYS AGAINST THE ASSUMED CONVENTIONAL USE OF THE SIDE-ENTRANCES IN THE CLASSICAL PERIOD.

A. Instances Are Found Where a Character Who Goes, or Comes from Abroad, or from the Open Country, Passes through the City First, or Home Region, If the City is Not Involved.

B. The Harbor and City, or Home Region, Are on Opposite Sides.

C. Characters Occasionally Pass through the Scene of Action, Entering on the One Side and Departing on the Other, though They Are Thought of as Coming from Distant Lands and Also of Leaving the Scene for Other Foreign Parts.

D. The Application of the Convention Often Tends to Destroy the Illusion.

E. Some Situations Arise Where the Entrances Must Necessarily Be without Significance.

F. The City Is Entirely Neglected in the Action of a Few Plays.

A. Instances Are Found Where a Character Who Goes, or Comes from Abroad, or from the Open Country, Passes through the City First, or Home Region, If the City is Not Involved.

Ajax.—The scene is laid before the tent¹ of Ajax, near Cape Rhoeteum on the northern coast of Troad. On the spectator's right is represented the home-region,—in this case, that of the Greek camp. "To the spectator's left is the region of the open country, stretching east and south from the camp, over the plain of Troy, towards those 'Mysian highlands' from which Teucer returns (v. 720)".² The messenger enters at v. 719 and says (vv. 720 ff.): Τεῦκρος πάρεστιν ἄρτι Μυσίων ἀπὸ | κρημνῶν μέσον δὲ προσμολὼν στρατῆγιον | κυδάζεται τοῖς πᾶσιν Ἀργείοις ὁμοῦ. Thus observe that Teucer, who comes from the open country, or foreign parts, arrives first at the generals' quarters in *mid camp*, the conventional home-region. It is true that Teucer does not enter at this point, but the messenger entered immediately and announced his arrival. In this way the theatrical effect was precisely the same as it would have been had Teucer come on in person. The messenger must have entered from the side of the open country, and yet he came directly from the camp.

Bacchae.³—Scene: Before the palace of Pentheus in Thebes. If the conventional significance of the parodoi applied, the right side represents the city; the left the open country; foreign regions have nothing to do with this play. All characters in the play, except Teiresias, who enters from the city, seem to go to and return from Mt. Cithaeron,⁴ which should be on the side of

¹ Jebb (ed. *Ajax ad v. 1*) locates the tent at the eastern end of the camp; cf. v. 3: καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ σκηναῖς σε ναυτικαῖς ὄρω.

² Quoted from Jebb, *Ajax*, p. 10.

³ See Niejahr, op. cit., p. 8.

⁴ Excepting, of course, those characters that come upon the scene from the palace.

the open country. Observe that the road from the palace to Cithaeron, according to the poet's conception, leads through the city. Pentheus says to an attendant at v. 352: οἱ δ' ἀνὰ πόλιν στείχοντες ἐξιχνεύσατε | τὸν θηλύμορφον ξένον. Dionysus had departed for Cithaeron at v. 63. Pentheus says v. 840: καὶ πῶς δι' ἄστεως εἴμι Κυδμείους λαθών; see also v. 855, and 961: κόμιζε διὰ μέσης με Θηβαίας χθονός.

Electra (Eur.).—The action takes place before the Peasant's cottage on the borders of Argolis.¹ The right parodos leads from the city of Argos; the left from abroad. Electra asks the Peasant, with whom she is living, to go to the ancient fosterer of her sire (v. 410): δε ἀμφὶ ποταμὸν Τάναον Ἀργείας ὄρους | τέμνοντα γαίης Σπυρτιάτιδος τε γῆς | ποιμναὶς ὁμαρτεῖ, πόλεος ἐκβεβλημένος. Thus the Old Man, who enters at v. 487, should come on the scene by the left entrance, since he comes from remote regions. He had seen, however, Aegisthus on his way; cf. vv. 621 ff.: Old Man. Αἴγισθον εἶδον, ἥνιχ' εἶπον ἐνθάδε. Orestes. προσηκίμην τὸ ῥηθέν. ἐν ποίσις τόποις; Old Man. ἀγρῶν πέλας τῶνδ' ἱπποφορβίων ἐπι. The estate of Aegisthus was certainly conceived as being between the Peasant's cottage and the city, and should be on the side of the home-region. At any rate, the estate is *rus domesticum*, as τῶνδε shows. If, on the other hand, the Old Man should be thought of as coming *rure domestico*, not from distant parts, another difficulty is encountered. The Old Man stops on his way at Agamemnon's tomb (v. 509); ἦλθον γὰρ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τάφον. Orestes and Pylades, who came from abroad, also passed by the tomb (cf. vv. 510 ff.). Orestes, Pylades, and the Old Man, therefore, should enter upon the scene from the same side, although the Old Man, under our present assumption, comes from the home-region, and Orestes and Pylades from abroad.

Hecuba.—Scene: Before Agamemnon's tent in the camp of the Greeks on the coast of the Thracian Chersonese. The Greek camp represents the home-region. Polymestor alone comes from a distance; cf. vv. 963 ff.: τυγχάνω γὰρ ἐν μέσοις Θρηκῆς ὄροις | ἀπὼν, ὅτ' ἦλθες δεῦρ'· ἐπεὶ δ' ἀφικόμην, | ἤδη πόδ' ἔξω δωμαίων αἶροντί μοι | ἐς ταῦτόν ἤδε συμπίτνει δμῶς σείθεν, κτλ. The maid-servant had to pass through the camp of the Greeks when she departed to summon Polymestor, as is shown by v. 889: πέμψον δέ μοι τήνδ' ἀσφαλῶς διὰ στρατοῦ | γυναῖκα. Polymestor and the maid-servant must have entered upon the scene by the same parodos

¹ Cf. v. 246: ἐκ τοῦ δὲ ναίεις ἐνθάδ' ἄστεως ἐκάς;

by which the maid-servant had previously departed. In other words, Polymestor, though he comes from a distance, must pass through the camp, the side of the home-region.¹

Heracleidae—Scene: At Marathon in the fore court of the temple. The place is represented as being very near to Athens and almost identical with it.² The home-region, then, would include Athens, as well as Marathon. The other parodos leads to distant parts whence the Argive army is coming. Demophon, who leaves the scene at v. 352 on the right (to Athens), in order to bring together his men, saw the Argive host (cf. v. 390). Thus Demophon must have departed by the same parodos by which Copeus entered at v. 55 from the Argive army.

Heracles.—Scene: Before Heracles' house in Thebes. The right parodos leads to the city; the left from abroad. Heracles, on his return from abroad, should have entered from the left. But he passed through the city: Amphitryon (v. 593). ὤφθη εἰσελθὼν πόλιν· ἐπεὶ δ' ὤφθη, ὄρα | ἐχθροὺς ἀθροίσας μὴ παρὰ γνώμην πίσης. Heracles. μέλει μὲν οὐδὲν εἴ με πᾶς εἶδεν πόλιν.

Iphigeneia at Aulis.—Scene: In the Greek camp at Aulis, outside the tent of Agamemnon. On the right side is placed the camp; on the left the way leads to the open country and to Argos. Among those who use the left entrance are the Old Servant of Agamemnon, who departs at v. 156 with a letter to Clytaemestra, Clytaemestra and Iphigeneia, who have come from Argos in a chariot (v. 598). It is clear, then, that the left parodos leads from abroad. The chorus, consisting of maidens of Chalcis in the isle of Euboea, have crossed over to Aulis and enter upon the scene at 164: ἔμολον ἀμφὶ παρακτίαν | ψάμαθον Αὐλίδος ἐναλίως, | Εὐρίπου διὰ χενμάτων | κέλσασα, στενόπορθμον | Χαλκίδα, πόλιν ἐμάν, προλιποῦσ', κ. τ. λ. In no way can it be said, as it seems to me, that the chorus comes from the home region. They came from abroad to see the fleet. But they do pass through the Greek camp to reach the scene of action; for they describe what they have seen (cf. vv. 192 ff.).³ Thus the right parodos is used not

¹ Schönborn, pp. 233 ff., has a different arrangement, but altogether arbitrary, as it seems to me.

² See Paley, ad v. 55.

³ Schönborn, p. 231, holds that the chorus should enter from the right, since they had wandered throughout the Greek camp before coming on the scene. Could Clytaemestra and her party, who stopped in the neighboring meadow to rest and graze the horses, be said to come from abroad, and not from the neighborhood!

only by those persons who come from the home-region, but also by the chorus who come from a distance.

Iphigeneia among the Taurians.—Scene: In front of the temple of Artemis, in the neighborhood of the Taurian coast. The seaside is identical with the open country; for the Herdsman, who enters at v. 238 from the pasture lands, had seen Orestes and Pylades on the coast. This side must also represent the foreign regions, since Orestes and Pylades, who come from abroad, enter from that quarter and, on their return to Greece, depart thither in company with Iphigeneia. On the right should be represented the home-region. The city seems to be at a remote distance from the scene of action and is not mentioned in that connection, but we assume that Thoas and the chorus enter from the city. Orestes, Iphigeneia, and Pylades leave the scene at v. 1233 by the parodos which leads to foreign lands, endeavoring to make their escape to Argos. But they are to pass through the city. vv. 1209 ff.

Iphigeneia. καὶ πόλει πέμψον τιν' ὅστις σημαίνει

Thoas. ποίας τύχας;

Iph. ἐν δόμοις μέμνειν ἀπαντας.

Thoas. μὴ συναντῶεν φόνη;

Iph. μυστὰ γὰρ τὰ τοιάδ' ἐστί.

Thoas. στείχε καὶ σήμαινε σύ.

Iph. μηδέν' εἰς ὄψιν πελάζειν.

Thoas. εὖ γε κηδεύεις πόλιν.

Ion.—Scene: Before the temple in the sacred precinct of Apollo. Xuthus and Creusa, entering the precinct from Athens, must first pass through Delphi. There seems to have been no approach to Delphi and to the temple from the north. Thus these characters must enter from the city side, although they come from abroad.

Oedipus Coloneus.—Scene: "At Colonus in Attica, a little less than a mile northwest of the Dipylon gate. The back-scene represents the sacred grove of the Eumenides, luxuriant with 'laurel, olive, and vine' (v. 17). Near the middle of the stage is seen a rock (v. 19), affording a seat which is supposed to be just within the bounds of the Grove"¹ (v. 37). The scenic details are so sharply defined that Jebb has been able to make

¹ Jebb, ad v. 1.

a drawing of the back-scene.¹ It is a fixed condition of the play that a road, passing by Colonus to Athens, skirted the grove, the inner and most sacred part of the grove being on the side furthest from the road. Now, an ancient road passes between Colonus Hippius and the Hill of Demeter Euechloüs, going in the direction of Athens.² We may reasonably suppose that the wandering Oedipus was conceived as entering Attica from the N. W., i. e., having passed into the Attic plain round the north end of Aegaleos. And, in that case, the road in question might well represent the route by which Sophocles, familiar with the local details of Colonus in his own day, imagined Oedipus as arriving. Then Oedipus moving towards Athens would have the grove on his right hand, if, as we assume, this grove was on the north side of Colonus Hippius, and on his left hand the audience. But Oedipus and Antigone are coming from abroad and should have entered on the spectator's left, not on the right, if we attempt to follow the current interpretation of Pollux.

*Orestes.*³—Scene: Before the Royal Palace at Argos. Pylades enters upon the scene from Phocis; vv. 725 ff.: ἀλλ' εἰσορῶ γὰρ τόνδε φίλτατον βροτῶν, | Πυλαΐδην, δρόμῳ στείχοντα Φωκίῳ ἀπο. Conventionally, he should enter on the left. We learn from his own statement, however, that he passed through the city; vv. 729 ff.: θάσσον ἢ με χρῆν προβαίνων ἰκόμην δι' Ἀστεως | ξύλλογον πόλεως ἀκούσας, τὸν δ' ἰδὼν αὐτὸς σαφῶς, κτλ.

Phoenissae.—Scene: Before the King's Palace in Thebes. It seems absurd to attach any significance to the use of the right, or left, parodos in this play; the Argive army is conceived as having encircled the city and all the roads to the scene of action run through the city. Assuming, however, that the rule is to be applied, Polyneices, who enters from the ranks of the invading Argives, *aus der Fremde*, should come on through the left entrance. He came through the city: vv. 361 ff.: οὕτω δὲ τάρβος εἰς φόβον τ' ἀφικόμην | μή τις δόλος με πρὸς κασιγνήτου κτάνη, | ὥστε ξιφήρη χεῖρ' ἔχων δι' Ἀστεως | κυκλῶν πρόσωπον ἦλθον. Eteocles, who enters at v. 446, also came from the city. It is clear that the city is conceived as being on both sides of the palace.⁴

¹ For topographical details of the play, see Jebb's Introduction, pp. 31 ff.

² See Jebb, *Introd.*, pp. 32 ff.

³ Niejahr, p. 9, finds still further indications in the play against the convention.

⁴ Cf. also Niejahr, p. 8.

Rhesus.—Scene: Before the tent of Hector in the camp at Troy. The Trojan camp is on the side of the home-region; the Greek camp would be on the side of the foreign parts. Rhesus, who comes from a distance, enters the scene from Troy and the Trojan camp (see vv. 264 ff., 282 ff., and 422 ff.), the conventional home-region.

Trachiniae.—Scene: Before the house of Heracles at Trachis, a village situated on a rocky spur under the heights ("Trachinian Rocks") which bound the plain of Malis on the south and west; the distance to the Malian coast was about six miles. The right parodos leads to the city of Trachis, beyond which is Mt. Oeta; the left parodos leads from abroad, over the Malian plain from the gulf. A messenger enters at v. 180 to announce the return of Heracles from his campaign in Euboea. This news he learns from Lichas, the herald, who "is proclaiming it to many in the meadow . . . and the Malian folk have thronged about him". Lichas enters the scene in person at v. 229 by the left side, since he is returning from abroad. We learn from the messenger that he was in the market-place just before he came on; v. 369 ff.:

ἔδοξεν οὖν μοι πρὸς σὲ δηλῶσαι τὸ πᾶν,
δέσποιν', ὃ τοῦδε τυγχάνω μαθὼν πάρα.
καὶ ταῦτα πολλοὶ πρὸς μέσῃ Τραχινίων
ἀγορᾷ συνεξήκουον ὡσαύτως ἐμοί.

The messenger repeats this statement at v. 423.

B. The Harbor and City, or Home-region, Are on Opposite Sides.

Agamemnon.—Scene: Before the Palace at Argos. The location of the palace with reference to the city is not clearly defined. The words of the Chorus at the approach of the Herald at v. 493, κήρυκ' ἀπ' ἀκτῆς τόνδ' ὄρω κατάσκιον | κλάδοις ἐλάας, might indicate that the city is not represented as being between the shore¹ and palace. According to Pollux the city and harbor should be on the same side.

Ajax. As pointed out on p. 387 above, the scene of action is laid before the tent of Ajax near the coast. The Greek camp, or

¹ Most editors, in the arrangement of the entrances and exits of the characters in classical dramas, treat the *seashore* and *harbor* as synonymous terms. Harbor, in the strict sense of the word, is used very rarely, if at all, by the dramatic poets of the classical period. As a dramatic motive, there is no connection between 'shore' and 'harbor'. In the *Rudens* of Plautus, the sea-coast is on one side of the scene, the city and harbor on the other.

the home-region, is on the right. Ajax, as the context clearly shows, does not depart through the camp, but in the opposite direction, when he goes to the shore at v. 654: ἀλλ' εἶμι πρὸς τε λουτρὰ καὶ παρακτίους | λειμῶνας.¹

Hippolytus.—Scene: Before the palace of Theseus in Troezen. At v. 1101 Hippolytus leaves the scene, having resolved to go into exile. He should have departed by the left parodos. A messenger enters at v. 1153 from the coast and relates the misfortune that has overtaken Hippolytus (cf. vv. 1173 ff.). Thus the shore in this play is on the left side, that is, on the side of foreign parts.

Cyclops. The scene is laid before the cave of Polyphemos. On the right side is represented the home-region,² the region of the inner port of the island whence the satyr shepherds enter from the open pastures; the harbor is on the left, from which direction Odysseus enters. The sea-coast, then, where the ships of the Greeks are lying, is on the opposite side to that of the home-region.

Philoctetes.—Scene: A lonely spot on the N. E. coast of Lemnos. A rocky cliff rises abruptly from the sea. The home-region is at the right of the cave of Philoctetes; the sea-coast represents foreign parts from which Neoptolemus and Odysseus enter. Here too the harbor and home-regions are on opposite sides.

Supplikes (Aes.). The scene is laid between the city of Argos and the harbor. Danaus and his daughters enter from the harbor. They have come over sea, fleeing from the sons of Aegyptus. The King arrives from the city at v. 234. It is clear that the city and harbor are conceived as being on different sides; the citizens have not heard of the arrival of the Danaïdes.³

Rhesus.—Scene: Before the tent of Hector in the Trojan camp at Troy. The Trojan camp represents the home-region, and is situated close to the city. The Greek camp is on the side of the foreign regions, here on the side of the scene toward the coast. This runs counter to the statement of Pollux which places the city and harbor on the same side.

¹ In the *Hecuba* also the shore is on the opposite side to that of the Greek camp, the home-region; for the Handmaid who has the corpse of Polydorus brought on from the coast (cf. v. 697 ἐπ' ἀκταῖς νιν κυρῷ θαλασσίαις) does not pass through the camp.

² See Schönborn, pp. 261 ff.

³ Cf. vv. 368, 369, and 484.

Trojan Women. The Greek camp, where the scene of action is laid, is situated between the harbor and the city of Troy. One parodos leads to the harbor where the ships lay at anchor; the other to the city in the near distance.¹

C. Characters Occasionally Pass through the Scene, Entering on the One Side and Departing on the Other, Although They Are Conceived As Coming from Distant Parts and as Leaving the Scene for Other Distant Parts.

Alcestis.—Scene: Before the Palace of Admetus in Phærae. Heracles enters at v. 476 from abroad. He has come from Tiryns at the bidding of Eurystheus en route to get the steeds of the Thracian Diomedes. Since he entered on the left, it would be natural for him to depart on the right, inasmuch as his destination is in the direction opposite to the direction whence he had come.

Medea.—Scene: In front of the house of Jason and Medea at Corinth. Aegeus enters on the left at v. 663; he is journeying from Delphi to Athens. Medea's words to Aegeus (v. 756) *χαίρων πορεύου* imply that he is passing by the house. Aegeus, then, should depart on the right, assuming that he entered on the left.

Prometheus. In her wanderings Io approaches the crag to which Prometheus is chained. She is represented as entering by one parodos and departing by the other.

D. The Application of the Convention Tends to Destroy the Illusion.

Eumenides. The opening scene represents the temple of Apollo at Delphi. At v. 93 Orestes departs for Athens, pursued by the Furies, by the left parodos. The scene changes to Athens before the shrine of Athena.² Orestes enters at v. 235. Conventionally, he should have come on by the left parodos. But it would enhance the illusion to have Orestes enter on the right, since he had just left the scene at v. 93 by the left parodos.

Again, Athena had left the scene at v. 482 for the Areopagus, followed by Orestes. The rest of the action takes place in the city. The chorus leaves the scene empty at v. 568. Athena, Orestes, and the chorus must have departed on the right. The scene is now shifted to the Areopagus. Just as all the characters and the chorus had left the scene by the right parodos at v. 568,

¹ Cf. vv. 235 ff.; 420 ff.; 775 ff.; 840; 1047 ff.; 1265 ff.

² I have accepted Verrall's arrangement throughout.

so now the convention would require them to enter upon the new scene by the same parodos. Certainly it would have been easier and more natural for them to enter the new scene by a different parodos.

Septem and Phoenissae. The scenes of both of these plays are laid before the palace in Thebes. The palace is within the walls of the city; the army is represented as having surrounded the city. Thus every approach to the palace must be through the city. Eteocles, in despatching the seven warriors to the various gates of the walled city, would certainly not send them all out by the same side, since the gates were in different directions.

Prometheus. Io enters at v. 561 from a distance; v. 573: *πλανῆ τε νῆστιν ἀνὰ τὰν | παραλίαν ψάμμαν* might serve as a reason for having her enter on the right, the coast from the theater at Athens being on the spectator's right.¹ Similarly, local conditions at Athens would be an argument in favor of having her depart from the scene of action to the left, the east; see vv. 707-8: *πρῶτον μὲν ἐνθένδ' ἡλίου πρὸς ἀντολὰς | στρέψασα σαυτὴν στείχ' ἀνηρότους γύας.*

E. Situations Where No Significance May Be Attached to the Side-Entrances.

Ajax. The chorus divides at v. 814. The one semi-chorus leaves the scene by the right parodos; the other by the left; cf. v. 805: *οἱ δ' ἐσπέρους ἀγκῶνας, οἱ δ' ἀντηλίους | ζητεῖτ' ἰόντες τὰνδρὸς ἔξοδον κακὴν.* The scene changes presently to a lonely spot on the seashore. The semi-choruses reenter the scene at v. 866 on opposite sides.

Alcestis. The action takes place before Admetus' palace at Pherae. At v. 860 Admetus is just entering the scene from the burial in company with the funeral attendants and the chorus when Heracles departs thither to bring back Alcestis. The departure of Heracles was almost simultaneous with the entrance of Admetus. Admetus does not meet Heracles, or see him, as would have happened had Heracles retired by the same parodos by which Admetus entered. We must assume, then, that Heracles used the other parodos, although his destination was the tomb.

¹ It must be admitted, however, that it is a very questionable procedure to assume that local, or topographical, considerations at Athens influenced to any great degree stage-managers in the arrangement of the entrances and exits of characters in those plays whose scenes are laid outside of Athens.

Electra (Soph.). Scene is laid before the palace at Mycenae. At the beginning of the play enter Orestes, Pylades, and Pedagogue from abroad. Orestes says at v. 73: σοὶ δ' ἤδη, γέρον, | τὸ σὸν μελίσθω βάντι φρουρῆσαι χρέος, | νῦν δ' ἔξιμεν. According to this arrangement, Orestes and Pylades are to go in one direction to the tomb of Agamemnon; the Pedagogue in the other in order to come on again disguised as a Phocian stranger. Thus the tomb of Agamemnon, to which Orestes and Pylades depart at v. 86 and from which they return at v. 1097, is on the opposite side to that from which Orestes, Pylades, and the Pedagogue enter originally, and whence the Pedagogue returns at v. 659 in the guise of a Phocian stranger. Observe, however, that Orestes and Pylades come on again as Phocian strangers (v. 1097), although they come from the tomb which the poet puts in the opposite direction to that from which the Pedagogue enters. We should infer that either parodos might be used by those persons who come from distant lands.

F. Dramas in Which the City is Neglected.¹

It has been pointed out in the early part of this paper that the city has no organic connection with the development of the plots in the classical tragedies. It should be added that in a few tragedies the city is entirely neglected in the action, though assumed to be in the neighborhood. In the *Agamemnon* and *Choephoroi* Argos is conceived as being near the palace, but is neglected in the plays: no character, except the chorus, enters from the city. In the *Electra* of Sophocles no mention is made of the city, nor does any character enter from, or depart to, the city. The same is true of the *Hippolytus*. In the *Suppliants* (Aes.), *Electra* (Eur.), *Heracleidae*, and *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* the city is far removed from the scene of action.

III.

COMEDY.

The theatrical requirements of Aristophanes' plays are sufficiently different from those of the tragedies to demand separate treatment in respect to the side-entrance convention. The Old Attic Comedy does not aim at representing action with any degree of accuracy. Its purpose is rather to give a succession of single events, more or less loosely connected. Any kind of a

¹ Cf. Niejahr, p. 11.

scene, preferably a preposterous and unreal one, is introduced to carry out the poet's fancy. The place of action may be changed freely, but the scene remains the same.¹ The license of the comic poets permitted them to throw all rules and conventions to the wind. Dramatic illusion is never taken seriously; the actors cannot resist the temptation to give the audience the wink. Even stage devices are introduced merely for the purpose of parody. Aristophanes, in his early plays, does not always inform us from what quarter a character comes. It was a matter of no concern. The necessary character turns up from some place or other at the proper moment. The poet does not feel constrained to create a motive for bringing a character upon the scene, nor for his removal.

The *Birds*, *Frogs*, and *Peace* defy the application of all conventional rules of theatrical and scenic representation. In the *Birds* Peithetaerus and Euelpides arrive at a desolate place in the woods and halt before a rock, the house of the Epops. Cloudcuckootown is founded; here the action takes place. The scene is absolutely fanciful and unreal. It is utterly absurd to attempt to draw a distinction between city and country, or home-region and foreign parts. The scene in the *Frogs*² has been appropriately called "On the Road to Hades". Dionysus and Xanthias are not represented as having entered from any particular place. They are simply in the theater at Athens; the audience of Athenian citizens is taken into their confidence. Now the house of Heracles is at hand; at the proper time they are on the banks of the Styx; Charon is at his post, ready to transport Dionysus to the opposite bank; soon they are off for Hades. The voyage was of course purely horse-play; it is very probable that they did not move half way around the orchestra.³ The scene now changes to Hades where the rest of the action takes place. But observe that Xanthias must reenter the scene on the opposite side from that by which he had departed.⁴ The

¹ Cf. Niejahr, *Quaest. Aristoph. Scaen.*, pp. 16 ff.

² Niejahr, *Commentatio Scaenica*, p. 12, has pointed out the absurdity of attempting to apply Pollux' rule to the *Frogs*.

³ Cf. v. 297: *ιερεῦ, διαφύλαξόν μ', ἐν' ᾧ σοι ξυμπότης*. The priest occupied the middle seat in the first row nearest the orchestra. Assuming that Dionysus was near the proscenium at the beginning of the scene, we are able to determine about how far he actually moved on the "voyage".

⁴ V. 193 (Charon to Xanthias) *οὐκ οὖν περιθρέξει δῆτα τὴν λίμνην κύκλῳ*;

opening scene of the *Peace* represents the house of Trygaeus in Athens. Trygaeus, mounted upon a beetle, ascends to heaven. The action is now represented as taking place in heaven. But no attempt is made at carrying out the illusion; at v. 296 Trygaeus bids all the people in Athens to come to his aid. The people enter in the form of the chorus, not transported through the air, but march in from the city. It is obvious, I think, that no distinction could appropriately be made in the use of the parodoi in these plays.

If the distinction between country and city should be observed, only one parodos would be employed in the *Wasps*, *Clouds*, *Knights*, and *Thesmophoriazusae*.¹ The scene of each of these comedies is laid before a house in Athens.² All characters go to and enter from the city; no character enters from the country.³

We may conclude that the rule of Pollux has no reference to the above-named comedies. No conventionalized scene has yet been reached. In the two latest plays, however, viz., *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus*, there is discernible a contrast between city and country. For the *Ecclesiazusae*, see p. 380 above. The action of the *Plutus* takes place before the house of Plutus in Athens. At v. 229 Carion departs to the country to summon Chremylus' farm hands to the city (vv. 223-224): τοὺς ξυγγεώργους κάλεσον,—εὐρήσεις δ' ἴσως | ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς αὐτοὺς ταλαιπωρουμένους. These rustics enter from the country at v. 252. Blepsidemus enters from the city, vv. 337 ff.: καίτοι λόγος γ' ἦν, νῆ τὸν Ἡρακλέα, πολὺς | ἐν τοῖσι κουρείοισι τῶν καθημένων, κ. τ. λ. Thus both city and country are mentioned. It was in plays of this kind that the practice probably originated of having characters from the city enter on the spectator's right, those from the country on the left.

IV.

NEW COMEDY.

A thoroughly conventionalized and stereotyped scenic background occurs first in the New Comedy. The usual scene represents three houses on a street in a coast city, Athens, as a rule.

¹ Cf. Niejahr, op. cit., p. 13.

² In the *Thesmophoria* the scene changes from the house of Agathon to the Thesmophoria.

³ It is not clear from what quarter the Sausage-Seller comes in *Equites*, v. 146; he may enter from the country.

In one direction the street leads to the city, the marketplace, and the harbor, all of which were toward the west from the theater at Athens; in the other direction, to the east, the street leads into the country. Even the fragments of Menander are full enough to enable us to see that such a distinction in the use of the right and left entrances might have been, and probably was, observed. The scene in the *Periceironomena* represents the houses of Polemon and Pataecus on a street in Corinth.¹ The way to the right leads to the city, to the left into the country to Polemon's camp. Polemon rushes upon the scene, coming from the country, immediately after Davus had said (vv. 244-245): τὸν δεσπότην, ἃν ἐξ ἀγροῦ θάρσυνον πάλιν | ἔλθῃ, ταραχὴν οἷαν ποιήσῃ παραφανείς. Sosias leaves the scene at v. 64 for the country, but returns at v. 234, sent by Polemon. Davus departs at v. 146 to the city to bring back Moschion, who had gone there in fear of his father's anger. Davus, accompanied by Moschion, reenters at v. 147 from the city. These instances are sufficient; there is no doubt that one parodos is employed by those going to the city, the other parodos by persons entering from, or going to the country. In the *Epitrepontes* the scene is in the country before the houses of Charisius and Chaerestratus. But it is clear that Athens is on one side, while the country is conceived as being on the other side (cf. vv. 25 ff.). Syriscus, in company with his wife, enters at the beginning of the arbitration scene from the country.² He departs to the city at v. 245: εἰς πόλιν γὰρ ἔρχομαι. So Smicrines enters from the city (v. 361)³ whither he had gone at the end of the arbitration scene (v. 154). We may infer from the following quotation from other fragments of Menander that in these too, country, city, and agora have their usual significance in determining the direction whence a character should enter: *Samia*, v. 65: ἀλλ' εἰς καλὸν γὰρ τουτοῖσι παρόνθ' ὄρω | τὸν Παρμένοντ' ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς. *Georgos*, v. 18: οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ τὸν ἀδελφὸν εἰ νῦν ἐξ ἀγροῦ | ἐνθάδ' ἐπιδημεῖ; v. 31: οὗτος κατὰ τύχην προσέρχεται | αὐτῶν ὁ θεράπων ἐξ ἀγροῦ Δᾶος; v. 76: ἄπεισιν εἰς ἀγρόν; v. 79: καὶ ταῦτ' ἐν ᾧσιν. *Citharistes*, v. 49: πρὸς ἀγορὰν δ' οὕτως ἄμα | προάγων ἀκούσῃ

¹ See Capps, *Introd. to Peri.*, p. 144. I have followed Capps' interpretations throughout both in respect to the arrangement of the lines and the entrances and exits of the characters.

² Capps, *Act II, Scene 1*.

³ Σμικρίνης ἀναστρέφει | ἐξ ἀστεως πάλιν.

καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔν μοι γενοῦ | σύμβουλος ; v. 54 : μεταπέμπετ' ἐξ ἀγροῦ με
Μοσχίων ; v. 56 : εἰς ἀγρὸν ἔφευγεν ; v. 64 : ἄρτι πρὸς ἀγορὰν πορεύσομαι.
Colax, v. 48 : ἰβόων ἂν εὐθὺς παρακολουθῶν ἐν ἀγορᾷ.

The comedies of Plautus and Terence give us the best proofs for the existence of a convention and the sphere of its operation.¹ The diversity of scenes in the tragedies and comedies of the classical period, scenes that are usually hazily defined, and the absence of a specific statement in the text as to the quarter whence an actor enters, have already been observed. The same scenic background, on the other hand, would serve for almost all of the plays of Plautus and Terence. Three houses, fronting upon a street in a coast city, is the conventional scene. Athens is the scene of twelve of Plautus' plays, and of all of Terence's, except the *Heauton*. There is rarely any question about the place from which a character enters, or in what particular place a character may be found during the course of the play. The expressions *ad forum*, *a foro*, *in foro*, *apud forum*, *in urbe*, *ex urbe*, *rus*, *ruri*, *rure*, *a portu*, *ad portum*, *in portum*, *apud portum*, *in Piraeum*, *a Piraeo*, *peregre*, occur frequently in nearly every play; it is needless to quote examples. But it is from those plays whose scenes are laid at other places² than Athens that we may best learn how thoroughly conventionalized the scene in the New Comedy had come to be. Local references³ are not infrequent, and are often correct, but in general the business is represented as taking place at Athens. For example,

¹ I do not mean by this that I subscribe to the view that the Athenian convention was taken over by the Roman stage. It seems not improbable that Plautus and Terence are simply translating the convenient dramatic motives offered by the terms, *forum*, *harbor*, *country*, etc., as found in the Greek originals, without attempting to preserve their theatrical significance in the production of the Roman comedies. This may be inferred from the apparent confusion in the use of 'right' and 'left'. For example, in the *Rudens* the barren shore (or country) is on the actor's right (see v. 156) *hac ad dexteram: viden secundum litus*; the city and harbor on the left, see p. 401 below. In the *Amphitruo* the harbor is on the actor's right. Sosias enters from the harbor, v. 333. Mercury, who is facing the audience, says on Sosias' arrival: *hinc enim dextra vox aures, ut videtur, verberat*. In the *Andria* the *forum* is on the actor's right (iv. 3. 19). Thus the situation in the *Andria* and *Amphitruo* is different from that in the *Rudens*; in the latter the harbor and forum are on the actor's left, as is the case in the Greek theater.

² Knapp, *Class. Phil.* II (1907), pp. 4 ff.

³ Knapp, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

in the *Amphitruo* Thebes is the scene of action ; but the harbor is introduced just as if the scene were laid at Athens.¹ In the *Poenulus* also characters enter from the harbor, though the action is supposed to take place at Calydon in Aetolia.² Thus the city, market-place, harbor, and country play conspicuous parts not only in the plays whose scenes are laid at Athens and other coast cities, but also in those plays whose scenes are laid in inland cities. Even accuracy in local touches is sacrificed, or disregarded, to meet the demands of a stage convention. It may be stated as a matter upon which all are agreed that in all of the dramas of Plautus and Terence, except the *Rudens* and *Heauton*, no difficulty is encountered by assuming that the side on which a person should enter, or depart, was regulated by fixed convention. The scenic arrangements of the *Rudens* and *Heauton* require a somewhat more detailed consideration.

The scene of the *Rudens* is laid in the country near the sea coast. The city of Cyrene is in the near distance. Assuming the existence of the convention, there is no reason why it may not be applied to this play. One parodos should lead to the town and harbor, the other to the open country, here the barren shore. Plesidippus, accompanied by friends, enters from the harbor at v. 89 (cf. v. 91 : neque quivi ad portum lenonem prehendere). Fishermen enter from the city at v. 290 (cf. v. 295 Cotidie ex urbe ad mare huc prodimus pabulatum). Trachalio, servant of Plesidippus, enters from the city at v. 306.³ Labrax enters from the shore at v. 485. Trachalio departs thither at v. 775 to summon Plesidippus. They both return from the shore at 839, Plesidippus having left his three friends on the coast. Plesidippus returns now to the city with Labrax, but sends Trachalio back to the shore to tell his companions to proceed by another route *into the city to the harbor* : iube illos in urbem ire obviam ad portum. It is perfectly clear that the city and harbor are on one side of the scene, the seashore and open country on

¹ V. 148, sed Amphitruonis illic est servus Sosia : a portu illic nunc huc cum lanterna advenit.

² V. 114, Is heri huc in portum navi venit vesperi. The poet seems to forget that the scene is not Athens ; cf. v. 372, Ac te faciet ut sies civis Attica atque libera.

³ His master, on leaving that morning, ad portum se aibat ire ; me huc obviam iussit sibi venire ad Veneris fanum.

the other.¹ The situation in the *Heautontimorumenos* is similar to that in the *Rudens*. The scene is laid in the country near Athens before the houses of Chremes and Menedemus. But the highway leads in one direction to the city and harbor, and in the other into the country.

We may justly conclude from the test to which the statement of Pollux on the parodoi has been subjected through its application to the plays, that the rule, either taken literally, or as interpreted by commentators, does not fit the classical drama. Such a convention is quite out of harmony with the conditions of the fifth century theater and would have been inappropriate. On the other hand, it cannot be doubted that in the stereotyped scene of the New Comedy the side-entrances had come to have a conventional significance which Pollux is, apparently, endeavoring to describe.

KELLEY REES.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

¹Sonnenschein (Introd. *Rudens*, p. 15) says that one entrance leads from Cyrene and its harbor, i. e., peregre in relation to the inhabitants of the coast. But surely no foreign regions are involved in this play.

II.—DERIVATIVES OF THE ROOT *bhē(y)*- 'TO STRIKE; BIND'.

1. To announce that one and the same root exhibits nearly opposite meanings, virtual countersenses, is likely again to provoke the hostility of surprise. Not a few times before now (e. g. in AJP. 26, 177, 183, 185, 189, 194, 202; TAPA. 37, 8 [41, 33 peg > <tie]; JAOS. 27, 412-413; Cl. Quart. 1, 19) I have commented on the contrast groups split > <splice and stick (i. e. pierce) > <stitch, and so far as the semantic problem broached has provoked comment the comment has taken the form of the easy, impatient sneer of those who do not take the trouble to read, much less to weigh, evidence. The evidence for this contrast association-group¹ is, however, irrefragable, and I return to a question I raised long ago, viz: Whether metaphor is not the permanent factor in Language (Cl. Rev. 13, 400). This problem I begin to conceive almost physiologically, and I ask myself whether, when the generations of neolithic man had conceived of sewing as a pierce-bind process, there was not some physiological record of this conception left behind in the brain convolutions, a record transmitted to a bronze age posterity, transmissible since to all the sons of men. And yet there is no need to materialize the metaphor, for stitching has always remained a pierce-bind process. But I do not mean now to marshall the evidence for the general proposition stated in the diagrams stick > <stich, split > <splice,² but will

¹ I add to former examples given in the citations above such instances as ζωστήρι προσθείς (= girdle pegged > bound, in Sophocles), and Od. 11, 228 (ap. AJP. 31, 421, fn. 2). In the language of magic, conversely, *καταδέω* (contrasting with Lat. defigo) is used of pegging down the tabellae defixionis (see Jevons in Anthropology and the Classics, p. 109).

² As regards this general semantic problem, cf. Eng. *clips*, defined in a pocket dictionary by "cuts with shears, curtails—embraces". On these definitions Stormonth remarks: "The two preceding entries [cuts, embraces] are connected in sense and etymology, because the ideas *clasping*, *grasping* and *cutting* are clearly interchangeable, and derivable the one from the other". MEng. *girden* | *garden* means (1) 'to enclose, bind round', (2) 'to strike, cut'.

proceed to exhibit particular instances, now by restudying the root *bhē(y)*- (AJP. 26. 179, 14) in some of its derivatives.

i *φί-λος, φί-λυρα, φτ-μός*.

2. I would define *φί-λος* by quasi 'con-iunctus', cf. Skr. *bāndh-u-s* 'amicus, necessarius'.¹ Both the 'linden-tree' and the 'bast' derived therefrom—bast is found in the pile-dwellings, and was used as twine or cordage in that remote antiquity (see Schrader, *Reallex.* p. 841)—are designated by *φί-λυρα* (*φιλύρα*) [tautological, quasi 'bind-strip', with *-λυρα*: Lat. *lō-rum* 'thong', *lō-ra* 'strap' (Fay, AJP. 26, 172)].

The *φτ-μός* or 'muzzle-strap' also designated a bast-like material, I take it, and Aristophanes used *φιμός* of tying a halter about a man's neck [cf. § 25, fn.]; cf. *fī-lum* 'thread', *fū-nis*² (*ū* from *oy*) 'rope', *felix/filix* 'fern' (named from its filaments), Germ. *bilsen* (Kraut), a plant used in exorcising (i. e. 'binding') evil spirits. The *φύλη*, a cooking pan in Homer, may have succeeded a woven or bark cooking vessel (cf. Ir. *rúsc* 'rinde; gefäss aus rinde, korb; cortex'; and see Walde, s. v. *cortina*). If Germ. *bil* meant 'lenis' (see Prellwitz, s. v. *φίλος*) the primary sense was 'flexible, pliable', and we may talk of a secondary root *bhi-l*. But *bil*- seems rather first to have meant 'iustus' (cf. Paul, *Wtbch.*, s. v. *billig*)—which belongs to Skr. *yāti* 'binds' (vide auct. ap. Walde cit.). This explanation is also valid for *Weich-bild* 'Stadt-bezirk' or, as we say in English, 'bounds' or 'confines' of a town (cf. Lat. *fī-nes* 'bounds' ?)—unless *Weich-bild* first meant 'urbana iurisdictio'. Both these senses of *bil*- are found in Celtic, cf. Ir. *bil* 'good' (i. e. 'iustus') and *bil* (stem *bili-* or *bilio-*) 'rand' (i. e. 'border, binding, boundary' cf. xi below = § 28). All this amounts to pretty solid evidence for a stem *bhil*- quasi 'iunctum', cf. Skr. *yuklā-m*

¹ This reminds me that long ago, in a spirit not altogether of levity, I sought to explain Lat. *filia* by 'spinster' (Cl. Rev. 13, 400). It now seems to me seriously worth while to connect *filius* with *φίλος*, even at the cost of questioning the relation between *filius* and the Umbrian "sucking pigs" (*felfisif*). If the root was *bhē(y)*-, an Italic stem *fēlio-* is quite allowable, whence Umbr. *fel*. (von Planta, no. 293. 2) = Lat. *fil<ius>*. Note the degradation of *bāndh-u-s* in the Sanskrit compound '*brahmabandhū-s*' 'Priestergeselle' (in a contemptuous sense), as in *bāndhula-s* 'bastard' (v. on νόθος, AJP. 25. 380).

² The sept of Lith. *grinis* (see Walde, s. v.) is also available for comparison. In that case *φίλος* is abnormal (?) for **θίλος*, but cf. *βίος*: Lat. *vivo*.

'passend', i. e. 'aptum, iustum', definitions which suit the German and Celtic adjectives, while for *φίλος* the sense of 'coniunctus' (cf. Skr. *bāndhu-s* 'amicus') is appropriate.¹

3. The root *bhēy-* 'binden', extended by *dh*, appears further in Goth. *baidjan*: OBul. *bēditi* 'costringere' (i. e. 'to draw tight with cords', see Fay, op. cit., 179 and, for the kinship of Goth. *baidjan* with Skr. *bādh-ate* cf. Solmsen, KZ., 37, 24 fn.). Similarly Germ. *binden* means 'to constrain'. I also derive Ir. *cobeden cobodlas* 'coniunctio; manus' (cf. Fick, I⁴, p. 491) from the root *bhē(y)-dh-* 'iungere' (aliter Thurneysen, Gram., p. 457, where *cobodlus* is the form cited), and likewise *buden* 'manus' (start-form *bodīnā*, Fick-Stokes, p. 176), cf. Lat. *fib-ra* 'nervus', *fab-er* 'joiner'. In Skr. *bhī-s* 'angst, anxietas' (cf. *anxius*: *angit* 'schnürt') the sense of 'metus' has developed, cf. *bhāyate* 'metuit': Lith. *bai-dy-ti* 'to scare' [?: the root *sker-* 'caedere'], wherein *-dy-* is to be identified with the determinative syllables in *io-thi-ω* (?: *θειω*; cf. TAPA. 41, 29, fn.) and Lat. *au-di-o*, *con-di-o* (pace nonnullorum dixerim).

4. To be sure, we may more easily explain Skr. *bhāyate* 'metuit' from the sense 'to strike'² as found in OBulg. *biti* 'schlagen', though it is not impossible, as I must add for semantic completeness, that the sense 'schlagen' has developed secondarily, after, if not from, 'binden'. Thus *bičī* 'whip', and other Slavic words meaning 'whip, rod, stake' might first have had the sense of 'withy, lash' whence, in the verb, ['to bind, lash,] beat', as in the Horatian *plectuntur Achivi*. But on the other hand, in locutions like "einen in fesseln schlagen", "schafe auf die weide schlagen", the connotation of 'binding, lashing' is found, and in the rope-maker's phrase "tau, reef schlagen" *schlagen* means 'to twine together'. Still I conclude that, in our root *bhēy-*, 'schlagen' was the more original meaning (see §§7, 11), though 'binden' was doubtless also proethnic.

¹ In the following excerpt from Hesiod (Fr. 157, 3-4), *σύν τε πόδας χεῖρας τε δέει γλῶσσαν τε νόον τε/δεσμοῖς ἀφράστοισι, φιλεῖ δέ εἰ [=τὸν πίνοντα] μαλθακῶς ἔπνος*, the sense of 'binds' may be read into *φιλεῖ*. This does not hurt the interpretation (cf. Tom Moore's "Ere slumber's chain hath bound me" with Aen. 2, 253), but is not warranted, of course, by word-history.

² The differentiation of strikes, beats, cuts, splits (all = chops) is unoriginal (see Fay, Cl. Quart. 1. 18, Mod. Lang. Notes 22, 38 fn., TAPA, 37, 8-9; and below, § 7 fn. 2).

ii Eng. *bent*: Germ. *binse*.

5. The *bent* or *bent-grass* is "a coarse grass which creeps and roots rapidly through the soil by its wiry and jointed stems". The West Germanic startform is *binut*, which I further derive from **bhi-nodu-s* quasi 'bind-weed', from *bhi-*: *bhēy-* 'binden' + *nodu-s*: *ne-d-* as reflected in OIr. *nenaid* and Eng. *nettle*. In Grimm's lexicon, s. v. *binse*, a sort of regret is expressed that *binse* cannot be reconciled with *binden* as Lat. *iuncus*¹ is (there) derived from *iungit*.—On Germ. *bi-nesson*, see below (iv).

iii German *bast*: *binden*.

6. The cognation of these words lies deep seated in the German folk-consciousness, though we can no longer derive the noun from the verb as Grimm did, but I think I have a solution that will preserve the cognation at the expense of the derivation. I am going to suppose that the notandum in *bast* does not describe what bast is used for, but how it was obtained. For the technique employed nowadays in the production of the linden bast of commerce it is enough to refer to the German encyclopaedias, but I have been able to make minute inquiries of an artisan friend of mine who worked in his boyhood in the bast industry on the Russo-German frontier. The present process—with tools, it must be remembered, of a far different detailed shape and total potency to neolithic tools—does not suggest the etymology I have to present, but my informant told me of an Englishman who came to his village and unsuccessfully attempted to expedite the preparation of bast by a method of 'beating' the outer bark away from it. Preparation by beating is demonstrably the method—or at least a method—of obtaining bast followed not long ago by neolithic savages in the South Seas and in America.² And, in the native district of my friend, to get

¹ In *iūncus* I find a tautological compound; *iū-*: Skr. *yānti* 'binds' + *nc*: Lat. *necessitas* 'quae vincit' (see Fay, TAPA. 37, 11 sq.), Goth. *nehtw* 'iuxta' (cf. Span. *junto* 'prope'), OIr. *ē-ess* 'poeta' (cf. for the meaning Perso-Skr. *bandin-* and Gr. *πάψ-ψός*), *ē-en* 'necessitas'. Folk-Latin *iūncus* has *iū* from *iūnxi*, *iūnctus*. At least as long as a root *yōi-n-* 'nectere' is not otherwise proved I shall remain skeptical about the startform *yōini-(co)* inferred from *iūncus* and modern Irish *aoín*, especially in view of the proximity of the Anglo-French "root" *yōi(g)n* 'iungere' (cf. TAPA. 41, 50).

² "Another kind of textile . . . is the result of beating out the bast or inner bark of certain trees. In Mexico, all over Central America, in the South

the bast of other trees than the linden, e. g. the willow, beating was the method employed. Not only bast, but flax has been found in the Swiss pile dwellings and doubtless the neolithic man reduced his flax to filaments by a process of beating similar to the present process.

7. I would accordingly derive Pre-Germ. *ba-s-tu-s* (on *-s-tu-*, see Brugmann, Gr¹. II. 1, § 334) either from **bhə-s-tu-s* or **bho-s-tu-s* = 'quod caedendo paratur': *bhē(y)-*¹ extant in OBulg. *biti* 'caedere' (= schlagen)² and, as we have seen above, in *φι-λυρα* 'bast, linden'.

8. But how do we establish relation between *bhə-s-tu-s* 'caesum' and the root of *binden*, viz: *bhe-n(e)dh-* 'vincire'? I regard *bhe-* as nominal, quasi 'bast', while *-n(e)dh-* is the well known root meaning 'binden'; the complex = 'bast-bindet', cf. examples like Germ. *platzgreift*, Eng. *par[t]takes*.

9. This analysis of the "root" *bhen(e)dh-*, though new in detail, has been presented by me in substance before in an extended, however summary, analysis of the Indo-Iranian nasal verb-flexion (AJP., 25, 369-389; 26, 172-203, 377-408). This

American states . . . throughout equatorial Africa, in Oceanica . . . culminating in Hawaii, is to be seen a lacelike fabric with fibres intertwining like paper or felt, or in coarser fashion" (Mason, *Woman's Share in Primitive Culture*, p. 54). [Apropos of 'fabric' and 'fibres', as here used, see § 3].

¹ There is no reason why Lat. *fascia* 'band, bundle' (cf. Brugmann, l. c., p. 478) and even *φάσκωλος* 'scrip, purse' do not also belong to this root, as well as Lat. *fiscus*, *fiscina*, *fiscella*, names of baskets made of rushes or twigs (the bast of willow twigs?), cf. Germ. *Binsenkorb*, and on *binse*, above).

² I must here recur to a point I have made in other connections (e. g. TAPA, 37, 9), viz.: that the further back we go in prehistory the less differentiated are the handicraft words, that 'caedit' (= beats-cuts-splits) retains in its lack of differentiation the habitude of whatever word was used by our neo-, or shall I say palaeo-, lithic ancestors to describe the activities of his stone tool of the *coup-de-poing* variety. Even now, when I 'chop' kindling with an ax, I 'split' or 'cut', 'strike' and 'break', all with the same tool, much what the primitive man did with the almond-shaped stone he wielded with his fist. Certainly one of his most important 'splittings' was addressed to the nucleus from which he would 'strike' or 'break' or even gently 'press' or 'rub' off a flint splinter. Tolerable evidence for 'rubs': 'splits' may be extracted from Germ. *reibt* 'rubs' [root, in a weak stage, *wri-bh-*]: Eng. *river* [: Lat. *ripa*; root, in a weak stage, *ri-p-*]. The phonic elements of *wri-bh-* are also found in *sc-rib-it* 'writes': *σκα-ρίφ-έται* 'scratches' (an outline), wherein we have a blend of the root *ri-bh-* with *sher-* 'caedere'. With *wri-bh-* cf. Eng. *writes* [root, *wri-d-*].

study in tautological composition¹ has been treated with the coldness of neglect, but a scholar as considerate as he is justly eminent was good enough to write me that he did not like "die Richtung". For myself, I do not like the tendency either, but neither do I dislike it. Nor is this a priggish pretence to set myself above liking and unliking. Personally I find the *-ne-* infix theory as now current altogether unreasonable, so unreasonable that I distinctly do not like it, and so I have offered a theory that does not offend my own reason¹ which, however it may be at fault, must be my ultimate rudder. The present analysis of *bhen(e)dh-* as 'bast-binden' is easier of acceptance, I realize, than the former analysis, which virtually defined by 'schlagen-binden'. But, alienating as 'schlagen-binden' may look at first sight, we virtually have it condensed in Eng. 'to rivet', if not in 'to clinch' (see other evidence in AJP. 26, p. 177, L; TAPA. 41, 35).

iv Germ. *binezson* 'inretire'; *beide*.

10. The analysis of *bhen(e)dh-* as 'bast-binden' is, *mut. mut.*, valid also for *bi-nezzon*, with *bi-* as in *φί-λυρα* and *fi-scus* (§§ 2, 7, fn., cf. also *binse*, 5), and *-nezzon* to the root *ne-d(h)-* 'binden'. This analysis of *bi-nezzon* allows us to conceive of the possible origin of the preverb *bhl-* as found in the Latin tautological compound *ambi* (cf. Schulze, lat. Eigenn. 542, fn. 3) and its kin. I have sought before now the origin of the preverbs in tautological compounds, of Lat. *dē-*, e. g. (Cl. Qt. I. 26), and Germ.

¹ In an essay not yet published I have called attention to the Chinese tautological compounds (see Steinthal-Misteli's Abr. d. Sprachwiss. II. 159 sq., especially 163). Similar compounds from Hungarian are cited by Wood (Mod. Phil. 9, 169) as follows: "*nyal-fal* 'lick-devour', *ken-fen* 'smear-daub', *csuss-mass* 'creep-crawl', etc." Wood's copious lists of colloquial Germanic "iteratives" and blends form a welcome addition to our available store of examples. He anticipated in Pub. MLA. 14, 335 my derivation (Cl. Rev. 20, 254) of *δαρ-δάπτει* from *δέρει + δάπτει*.

² As to the general question of method in semantics, the following words, though spoken in a different context, are instructive: "Malgré l'absence de moyens d'investigation, ce sont des problèmes qui, à quelque facile positivisme qu'on se résolve, reviennent se poser à l'esprit, mais restent malheureusement sans solution" (Brunot, Hist. d. l. langue Française, I, p. 52.). To which I (banally) add that the tentative solution of today may prove, or lead the way to, the accepted solution of the future.

ser- (TAPA. 37. 8).¹ In Germ. *bei-de* 'both' we may also have a derivative of *bhē(y)-* in the sense of 'iungere', cf. ζυγόν 'pair'. The root *yu-* 'iungere' (cf. Skr. *yāuti*) may be found in the 2d pers. dual and plural pronouns, e. g. Skr. *yu-v-ām*, *yū-y-ām* though, on the face of it, we should then expect in Greek *ζυ-μεῖς not ὑμεῖς. The derivation of 'you' from 'companions' (cf. the Skr. noun stem *yú-* 'comes', in the smaller Petersburg lexicon) is most plausible. Has **bhi-* 'comes' found a lodgment in Skr. *tú-bhyam*: Lat. *tibi*? The case suffix *-bhi-*, especially in the Sanskrit instr. plural in *-bhis*, might also be interpreted etymologically by 'in conjunction with'.

[10 a. To make clear my meaning, I suppose the *bh-* cases to have derived from various proethnic locutions in which a heteroclitic root-noun from *bhē(y)-* —e. g. *bhi-* (m. or f.; n.), *bhyo-* (m., n.), *bhaxy-* (in Lat. *tibei*), *bho-* (in Lat. *bus*)—in perhaps more cases than one (e. g. Skr. *-bhyas* may be a nom. sg., gen.-ablv. sg., or nom. plur.), formed phrases with other nouns. The meaning of this heteroclitic noun was something like 'coniunctio' > 'auxilium'. Thus Skr. *devé-bhis* (instr. plur.) means 'dei auxilium <sunt>', and *tú-bhyam* = 'tu auxilium'. It is well known that in Sanskrit the *bh* endings function, in regard of euphony, as independent words. We may illustrate by Osmanli *xodža ile* 'Meister mit' < 'Meister Begleitung'. Here *ile* remains half independent—in its euphony, to-wit—but has halfway become a mere case ending (see Finck, Haupttypen d. Sprachbaus, 81 sq.).—The original instrumental connotation of **tu* **bhyom* may have furnished the source for the so-called dative of agent.]

v Sanskrit *bhit-tis* 'mat; wall'.

11. We have cast our eyes far back to the neolithic period of our race and have recognized there on the evidence of φί-λυρα, pre-Germ. **bastus*: OBulg. *biti* 'caedere' a root *bhēy-*, descriptive of the activities of a *coup-de-poing* and with a range of meaning from 'ferire' to 'scindere'. This root as a nominal stem

¹ I cheerfully resign the particular example there chosen, viz: *serreissen* as a blend of *zerren* and *reissen*, and I did not gainsay the relation of *ser-* to Lat. *dis-*. The evidence for blended words, however, is too strong to gainsay because of the rareness of blending in the vocabulary of the Stern children (pace Thumb, IF. Anz. 27, 4). What with the curious precision, iteration, literalness of children on the one hand, and their small vocabulary on the other, why suppose that they must fall victims to the blending aphasia?

had the sense of 'bast', and the nominal sense so acted upon the verbal as to give to *bhē(y)*- a derived sense of 'binden'. Can we doubt that Skr. *bhit-tis* 'mat or wall of split reeds' is ultimately of the same provenience? True, for *bhit-tis* we find it convenient to talk of a root *bheyd*- 'findere', and to conceive of it as *bhē(y)*- + a determinative *-d*-, but the semantic relation of *bhit-tis*: *bheyd*- can scarcely be different from the relation of *φί-λυρα* and *βα-σι* to *bhē(y)*- 'caedere'. And could we prove *bhit-tis* to be of Indian provenience, we should still have to admit that the nominal sense of *bhit-tis* is reflected in *bhin-nās* 'coniunctus', *vyatibhinna* "unzertrennlich verbunden mit". But where full word history fails us—as it often perplexingly will—there is no such thing as dating or localizing a semantic process,¹ and if *bhinna* 'coniunctus' originated late in the separate life of

¹ I am not sure that I understand the bearing of Kluge's remarks, s. v. *nāhen*, to-wit: die sippe ist wohl durch vorhistorische entlehnung von einem volke zum andern gewandert so dass nāhen kein echt germ. wort wäre. If this remark seeks to palliate the semantic difference between *nāhen* 'suere' and *veei* 'spins' I do not realize any advantage in assuming a temporary foreign sojourn for members of this word sept. To begin with, the *veei* sept does not restrictedly signify 'spins' as *πέπλους τε νῆσαι* (Soph.) and *στήμονα νήσεις* (Aristophanes) show, but also goes further in describing the process of cloth making (cf. Meringer in Wch. Kl. Phil. 1910, 595, who furnishes a convenient formula for—I presume he does not fancy himself the first to have taken note of—the fact that a word may become allocated to describing a single or a further step in a complicated process). In Skr. *snāyati* the generalized sense of 'wraps, vestit' has advanced far beyond either 'sews' or 'spins' or 'weaves'. The original sense, even, as I have elsewhere noted, might have been 'sews' (from 'pricks', cf. AJP. 25, 376; for the stick-stitch-bind development also cf. *ράβδος* 'stick, switch (i. e. withe), rivet', *ράπης* 'switch': *ράπτει* 'stitches', Lith. *verp-ti* 'nēre'). Because of the *νεῦρον-nervus* group, I start with the noun sense 'sinew' and in conformity with my motto of "cherchez le dénominatif" (TAPA, 37, 8) I assume 'to sinew' as the earliest verb sense. From work done with *sinews* developed in one direction the sense 'to baste' (= sew, i. e. use a bast-thread; cf. contrariwise 'to tack, prick, stitch' wherein the activity of the needle is indicated), and in a second the sense 'to spin' (cf. Fr. *filer*, denom. to Lat. *filum* 'thread'), and in still another 'to plait' (cf. OIr. *sníim* 'flecto').—Though even if we start with 'spins' there is no reason to challenge the development to 'sews', for one has but to assume as an intermediary a process vaguely like modern 'darning', which is weaving with a needle, or 'knitting'. Should this seem a retrograde development one has but to recall the recent discussion (see Zupitza in Wch. Kl. Phil. 1910, 37-39) of how folk Latin *pi(n)sare* = 'to thresh' (cf. Plautine *flagro pinsare* = 'to flog with a whip or rod') is related to *pinsere* = "to pound in a mortar"—a combination of sense attested also by *τριβεῖν* and *terere*.

Sanskrit, whether under the influence of *bhittis* 'mat' or of *sam-bhinnas*—wherein the sense of conjunction is to be charged to *sam-* 'cum'—yet the nominal stem *bhēy-* 'bast' is not unlikely to have affected the "root" *bhēy-* 'caedere' at ever so remote a period, so that for us *bhēy-* has the two senses of 'caedere' and 'vincire' (i. e. 'suere').

vi Latin *fenestra*.

12. I formerly suggested the derivation of *fenestra* from *bhenedh-trā* 'hole, slot' (AJP. 26, 182), but if there was any Greek **φανηστρο* quasi 'lighter, revealer', I should far prefer a historic to a prehistoric startform. Brugmann's startform **bhe-nestra* (Gr². II. 1, § 255) is complicated, i. e. an *-es*-stem extended by a *-tro*-stem. I recur to the startform *bhenedhtrā* and, as there is no evidence for the definition 'hole, slot', I define, in conformity with the "root" *bhen(e)dh-* 'bastbinden' (§ 9), by something like 'shutter', cf. Lat. *fenestra clatrata*, *clathri* 'lattice, grate'. In the English poets *lattice* and, to a less extent, *grate* distinctly connote 'window',¹ while *wicket* conversely connotes a 'lattice' or 'grating'.² In Latin, *claustra* sometimes naturally implies 'porta' or 'fores' or 'operculum', e. g. in Mart. 10, 28, 8, *ferrea perpetua claustra tuere sera*, Aen. 2, 259, *pineae furtim | laxat claustra Sinon*. In the glosses *claustra* is defined by 'portae' aut 'ser[r]aturae'. In Plautus it is the latticed window that is chiefly in evidence, cf. As. 132, *concludere in festrā firmiter*, interpreted in the light of the *festra clatrata* of Mi. 379, and of the *iuncta fenestra* which barred out intrusive lovers (Horace, C. 1. 25; cf. Ov. Am. 1. 6. 17, where *inmitia claustra relaxa* applies to the door).³ Allusion to double shutters is clear in Ov. Am. 1. 5. 3, *pars ad aperta fuit, pars altera clausa fenestrae*.

13. If we accept Brugmann's startform, to say nothing more of the complicated suffixation,⁴ we have in *fenestra* a quite

¹ Among the Cretan finds of the last few years the representations of windows distinctly suggest gratings or lattices (see Encyc. Brit. 1, pl. IV, i.).

² I rather think *wicket* originally meant something like 'lattice', and is perhaps to be connected with *wicker*. A lumberman's *wicket* is a shelter made of boughs of trees.

³ In the next verse *ia-nua* is the 'entry', not the 'door'.

⁴ The suffixation of *ἀγκιστρον* also looks complicated. Assuming that the barbed fish-hook replaced a barbed fish-spear—and *ἀγκ-* certainly contributes the note of 'barb'—, (*-κ*)ιστρον: Lat. *caedit* 'strikes' may furnish the apparent suffix, cf. Eng. *striker* 'harpoon'. In the locution 'to strike a fish' *strike* means 'to get on the hook by a sort of jerk'.

isolated survival of the (secondary) root *bhen-* 'φαίνει' whereas *bhenedh-trā* 'lattice' belongs with *offendix* (root *bhendh-*) 'band'.

14. For the fact of windows in a quite early type of house I refer to the hut-urn with a large window pictured in Mannus, II, 24. Either postes or a vestibulum are indicated also on these urns.

15. With the words for 'door', also, there is question whether the notandum is 'opening' or 'shutter'. Hesychius defines θυρίς (allocated to 'window') by ὀπή μικρά (of the 'hole'), but adds, θυρίδας Ἀττικοὶ τὰς τῶν γραμματείων πτυχάς (καὶ δίθυρον λέγουσιν, οὐ τρίθυρον, ἀλλὰ τρίπτυχον). As to θύρα, Lat. *fores* (stem *dhwor-o-*), I doubt not that the original sense was 'shutter', as it was for the other stem *wero-* in Umbr. *veris-co* 'apud portas'¹ (cf. n. plur. *veru*: OBulg. *vra-ta-*, unless we divide *vrat-a* [: Lat. *vertit* = *valvae*: *volvit*—which is not to separate *wert-* 'vertere' from *wer-* 'tegere, defendere', but to suggest that the sense 'vertere' had its origin in the turning of a **wer-to-m* on its cardo]).²

vii English *bee* 'biene'; Lat. *apis*.

16. With the root *bhēy-* in its secondary sense of 'binden' I would also connect our word *bee*, the 'carpenter[bee]' to wit, in his function of builder or 'joiner', cf. also Lat. *apis* 'bee': *apere* 'iungere, vincire'.

viii Umbr. *kom-bifia-* 'nuntiare, mandare', pf.-stem *-bifia-ns'*; Lat. *iubeo, vincio*.

17. In this Umbrian compound we have the root *bheydh-* (i. e. *bhēy-* + *dh-*) found also in *πείθεω* (cf. AJP. 26, 180) and in *fib-ra*

¹ Plural, like *fores*. Perhaps *d-* for *dh-* in Skr. *dvd-* is due, not to deaspiration in cases with *-bhyas*, etc., but to the influence of *dvd-* 'duo'.

² I will here add that proethnic *dhworo-* for which no etymology has been traced may be a complex in which the sound-picture of *woro-* has overlaid the sound-picture of **dhor-*: *θώραξ* 'cuirass' (covering for the breast); Skr. *dhārikā* 'columna' (postis). The question arises whether **dhor-* did not first describe the column of a door-way (cf. for the fact the hut-urn referred to in § 14 with its indicated 'portico'). [In Mexican cities the *portales* are porticoes in front of the shops, often located about the large public squares, and serving as booths for small merchandise. In many cases to go to the *portales* is to go to the public square. Was *forum* a collective designation in Italian towns for a mercantile colonnade similarly situated on one or more sides of a public square, like the *tabernae veteres* at Rome, say?—But the root of (supplanted) **dhor-* 'shutter' is perhaps found in provincial English *dern/darn* 'to hide, to stop up a hole'.

(§ 3). For the sense of 'nuntiare'¹ cf. Lat. *indicit* 'declares, proclaims, orders', where the meaning may have developed in a reverse order; and for 'mandare' Lat. *iniungit* 'enjoins, orders': *iubet*, which can hardly fail to contain in *iu-* a cognate of the root *yu-* in Skr. *yāti* 'joins' (cf. Skr. *yūñj-* defined in the simplex by "befehlen, auftragen, iniungere", and so obsolete Eng. *joins*), and in *-beo* a cognate of *dhē-* 'facere'. See TAPA. 41, 41 for a further development of this semantic problem.

18. But my real objective now is the complicated perfect stem, wherein *-ns'* [from *-nē(i)-?*] has been added to the present stem. Danielsson (accessible to me only as cited by von Planta II, p. 352) adduced by way of explanation the parallelism of Lat. *vi-* (in *vieo* 'flecto'): *vinki-* (in *vincio* 'I bind'). In the formation of *vincio* I have an interest of long standing. Almost twenty years ago I derived *vinxi* from *vi-n(e)x-i* (AJP. 13, 481), taking *vi-* as a preposition = Skr. *vi* 'apart'; and later (TAPA. 37, 15) I found in *vincio* a tautological compound of *vieo* and *necto*.² Now if in *vi-nci-o* 'I bind' *-nci-* is a tautological element there is a fair chance of finding the same element in the *-ns'* of the perfect stem *-bifia-ns'*,³ if *-bif-* also meant 'binden'. At any rate the analogy of *vincio* then had a ground. That the tautology is extant only in the perfect is curious, as though, to produce the note of intensification, a semantic reduplication,⁴ so to speak, had replaced the moribund syllable reduplication.

19. Besides *kom-bifians'* there is one instance of *dis-leralins'* 'diremerit, invitum fecerit' (vi, a 7), of untoward circumstances which vitiate an (ob)servatio avium. As *kombifians'* occurs also in a servatio (vi b, 48 sq.) it is by no means impossible that in a liturgical formula—as witness the 2d plur. impv. mid. Skr. *vārayadhvāt* which represents *-dhvam* contaminated by adjacent *-tāt* forms (cf. Whitney, Gr², § 571, d)—there was irradiation from the one *-ns'* perfect to the other. Perhaps *disleralins'ust*

¹ This sense of 'nuntiare' suggests an attempt to explain Gothic *bandwjan* 'to make signs'—with a flag, rag, bandeau, banner, to-wit: cf. Med. Lat. (Longobard) *bandum* 'vexillum'. Gothic *bandwo* 'Zeichen' has been more generalized—but is not to be connected with *φαίνω*.

² For the root *nēk-* 'vincire' I refer to § 5 fn. above, and to AJP. 31, 418; TAPA. 41, 31. Add Skr. *dhṛu-* 'net' (*a < n*).

³ Perhaps to be divided *-bif-an's-*, with *-an's-*: Lith. *dnka* 'knot, loop, noose', Gr. *κυν-άγκη* 'dog-leash' (: *-nēk-*, see TAPA. 37, 9).

⁴ I prefer to analyze *kom-bifia-ns'ust* 'nuntiaverit' as reflecting something like 'con-iussa- nexuerit'.

was the earlier of the two forms. At any rate it is susceptible to a rather obvious analysis, viz.: as *de-lira-liquirit* in the sense of <servator avium> deliraverit. Then, as von Planta has already observed (Gram. II, p. 350, fn. 2), *-lins'* represents a Latin **linx(it)*, like *finxit*, *pinxit*, *strinxit*.

20. The only other Umbrian perfect in *-ns'* is found in the stem *purdins'* 'porrexist', for the formation of which I see no way to plead irradiation. I suspect that in *-dins'* we must recognize another sigmatic perfect to a stem *-dink-*, cognate with Lat. (*in-*)*dico*, and with *δείκνυμι* (*-dink-*: *δείκνυμι* = Lat. *iungit*: *ζεύγνυμι*).

ix Germ. *beil* and Lat. *findit*.

20. The accepted derivation of OHG. *bihal* from **bhi-tlo-* 'schläger' seems to me not more probable than its analysis as *bhi-* (*bhay-*) + a cognate of the posterius in *δί-κελλα* 'two-(pronged-) mattock'. With 'strike-mattock' cf. Ger. *beut-heie* "stosz-hammer".—What reason based on a sound principle for rejecting the analysis of Lat. *findo*: Skr. *bhinádmī* as *bhi-* quasi 'strike' + *-nāḍ-* 'secare' (tautological, see § 9, fn.) in OIr. *snaidim* 'seco', Welsh *naddu* 'asciare, dolare'? That this Celtic "root" *snad-* is cognate with *s)nē-* in Germ. *nähen* and *nadel*, I further believe, nor is there any reason to question this cognation if, as suggested above (§ 11, fn.), the root *snē-* had a primitive sense 'to prick' which gradually gave way to the specialized senses of 'to sew, darn(?), weave, wrap' (Skr. *snāyati*)—whence 'to cover, protect' (in OIr. *snādim* 'protego').

21. I would here add a general remark on the relation of meaning in English *split* and *splice*. The process of splicing has two chief moments, first to *split* or unravel two rope ends and second to *plait* or *intertwine* those *split* ends together, but to the word chosen to designate the entire process only *split* makes a linguistic (phonetic) contribution. Similarly in Lat. *immolare* the 'meal-besprinkling' (quasi 'mealing') has come to designate the general act of 'sacrificing' [cf. also Skr. *badhnāti* "fesseln (bes. ein opfertier), darbringen, schlachten"; further illustrations in *γυνάξομαι* and *supplico*, and in *ἀποπατῶ*].¹ Now there was one neolithic process in which 'splitting' was the first act in a process of 'binding', the very important process of securing a tool or

¹ Extension of meaning to cover a further stage in an act involving several steps might be designated as 'sequel' or 'serial' meaning.

weapon to its handle. Here the handle must be 'split' or 'grooved' or 'notched' for the insertion of the implement which was then <gummed and> 'tied' securely with cords, sinews or the like. In extensions of the root *bhēy-* 'schlagen' we find the virtual sense of 'splicing' (as in Skr. *bhit-tis*; see § 11), as well as of 'splitting' (as in Lat. *findit*). Who is to show us that Lat. *fid-es* (plur.) 'strings' means rather 'splitters' (= something split off) than 'binders'? Cf. also *πεῖσμα* 'rope', which is as likely to come from **πειθσμα* 'split, thong, lash' as from **πενθσμα* 'band, binder'.

x Skr. *bhiṣṭaj-*.

22. In the analysis as *bhiṣ-ṭaj-* 'demon-driving' (cf. RV. 10, 97, 6 where a leech is called "fiend-slayer, chaser of disease") or 'angst-treibend' (AJP. 26, 399) I have come as near the truth as the Indo-Iranian usage of this word will ever warrant, I believe. The analysis as *bhi-ṣaj-* 'splint-binding' (cf. RV. 9, 112, 1; 10, 39, 3, where the leech looks after wounds and broken bones; also, for the cure of wounds, cf. 8, 22, 10; 8, 61, 17; 8, 68, 2) is also possible, with *bhi-* as in the *findit*-sept and *saj-* = the Sanskrit root meaning 'heften': Lith. *seg-ti* 'heften'. Here there is a difficulty, for we must apparently write the posterior for the Indo-Iranian group as *-seḡ*, while *seg-ti* has either *g* or *g^w*. Still the alternation of palatal and pure guttural lacks not for parallels.

23. If this provisional explanation of *bhi-ṣṭaj-* should haply be true, it may be confirmed by the testimony of *ἀκίομαι*. Chronologically *ἀκίομαι* seems first to mean 'curo, medeor' and second 'sarcio'. I would reverse this arrangement and start with quasi *sarcio*, cf. E 401, *φάρμακα πάσσων | ἡκέσας* = applying salves he bound-up <the wound>, Π 523, *τόδε καρτερόν ἔλκος ἀκείσσαι* = hoc grave vulnus liga. For the development of the sense of 'heals' from 'binds up' observe how, in our authorized version, "to bind up the broken-hearted" (Isaiah 61. 1) has become in Luke 4. 18 "to heal the broken-hearted". The root of *ἀκίομαι* is the root of *acus* 'needle', but the sense has derived from 'pricks' (see § 11, fn. 1).

24. We can hardly refuse to admit that the binding up of broken bones was within the skill of the prehistoric medical man and as he could neatly trepan the skull, his skill to stitch wounds with sinews may well be taken for granted.

25. The paragraphs on Skr. *bhiṣáj-* and Gr. ἀκείομαι were lying complete on my desk more than a month before the issue of Brugmann's discussion of these words in IF. 28, 285 seq. In view of that discussion it becomes necessary to make some additions to my previous brief statements. That in *bhi-ṣáj-* *bhi-* means 'bast'¹ and is not the preposition *abhi* with apocope is perhaps proved by *bheṣajá-* 'medicamentum', for neither secondary gradation nor an old alternation of the preverb *bhi-* with *bhaxy-* seems to me at all plausible. In Avestan, only the diphthongal forms are of record. If we write *bhaxy-saxḡd-* 'bast-binding' as a startform (*bhaxy-*: the root *bhēy-* :: Skr. *re-* [in *revánt-*]; *rāi-* 'res') the further reduction in *bhi-sáxḡ-* is entirely normal for noun-stems. Brugmann has rejected the ascription of the posterius in *bhi-sáj-* to the word-sept to which Lith. *segù* | *segiu* 'ich hefte, schnalle' belongs, and has connected it with Lat. *sāga* 'seer, witch', which is very attractive at first glance. But the root *sāg-* is, in my opinion a compound root, from *s(w)-* 'co-' (see TAPA. 41, 31) + *aḡ* 'agere' (cf. Lokr. *δγω*), and meant 'cogere; cogitare', senses which account not only for ἀκείομαι and Germ. *suchen*, but for such special nuances as *sagax* 'nasutus' (of a hunting dog), cf. ἡγεμόν 'dux', i. e. 'co-actor'; thus *praesagire* = 'prae-cogitare'. Or does *sāga* mean 'quae defigit', v. Ovid, Am. 3, 7, 29, ap. Jevons, l. c., p. 115.

26. Is Brugmann's phonetic objection to the association of *-saj-* with Lith. *segù* conclusive? It arises from the conflict between the *g* of Lithuanian and the *s* of Av. *baēšaza-*, and he disposes of the testimony of the *k* of *bhiṣák* (nom.) *bhiṣákti* (3d sg.) by calling the *k* secondary. But suppose the *s* of Avestan is secondary? And why should it not be? I need not discuss afresh the question of the derivation of palatals from (pure) gutturals in the proethnic speech, for the principles have already been laid down correctly by J. Schmidt in KZ. 25, 123 sq., and rediscovered about twenty years later by Hirt (BB. 24, 288), viz.: that what we will call the plain guttural series *k, g*, etc., suffered a change in a palatal environment² to what

¹ On the island of Cyprus *φιμόω* (v. § 2) and *φιμωτικός* are used to describe the 'binding' of exorcism (Jevons, *Anthrop. and the classics*, p. 116).

² This is, in substance, the view of J. Schmidt, but Hirt, who cannot bring himself away from the idea that, as *é* alternates with *o*, the *o* is derived from the *é* (see also his Gr. Gram., § 92 Anm.), thinks that *kyo* is involved in *kye*

may be best designated graphically by *kʸ*, *gʸ*, etc. Then in one and the same paradigm or word-sept there was alternation of *g* with *gʸ*, with a tendency toward a final victory of only one of the alternatives. Let us apply these theoretical considerations to our word-sept. In Lithuanian we have the alternation between *segù* (o/e verb) and *segiù* (yo/e verb); in Sanskrit, we have *bheṣaj-á-s*, but also *bheṣaj-yá-s*, *bhiṣákti*, but also *bhiṣaj-yáti*; cf. also, with intransitive value, *sájati* 'haftet' (ptc. *saktá-s* 'attached to'); in Avestan, as it would appear from Bartholomae's lexicon, *baēšas(a)-* and *baēšasy(a)-* are almost equally common, whether in verb or noun form. Proethnically there must have been an alternative of *g* with *gʸ* in kindred forms of this sept, and even in the same noun paradigm conflict between *-go-* and *-gʸe-* in the flexion. In Avestan this conflict was resolved in favor of *gʸe* (*gʸe*), but in Lithuanian and Sanskrit in favor of *-go-*.¹ If not, why not? Did not Greek resolve the conflict between *λελεω* and **λειτεω*² in favor of the former, and Latin the conflict between *ecus secuntur* and *equi* (plur.) *sequitur* in favor of the latter? So far as Sanskrit is concerned, *gʸ* (*gʸ*) is attested, to the best of my knowledge, only when *ḡt* stands as the product of *gt* > *ḡt*,³ which may be interpreted to mean that *kt* yielded *kʸt* (or *ḡt*) proethnically in this series. These facts may be represented as follows, with modifications of J. Schmidt's table (op. cit., p. 123):

Proethnic.		Sanskrit.	
II a)	$\kappa \quad \gamma \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} <\gamma't> \\ <\gamma't> \end{array} \right.$	k, c	$<(g) j> \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} sṭ^4 \\ sṭ \end{array} \right.$
b)	$\kappa' \quad \gamma' \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} <\gamma't> \\ <\gamma't> \end{array} \right.$	ç	$j (g) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} sṭ \\ sṭ \end{array} \right.$

it is not anymore than *ecus* is involved in *equi*. Hirt's most certain result lies in the correlation of the suffix *-go-* (i. e. *ko*) with *ḡo-* (i. e. *kʸo*), as in Skr. *lopā-ḡds/lopā-ka-s* 'fox' (v. p. 288), which can be due to no other cause than a levelling as between *kʸe* and *ko*, no matter which was the prior consonantism.

¹ On the general question of the divergent treatment of "ḡ" in Sanskrit and Avestan see Leonard Bloomfield in AJP. 32, p. 52, § 21.

² See a recent discussion of the conflict of κ and π forms of the interrogative in early Ionic in AJP. 32, 74 sq.

³ This is to regard the *ḡt* of *bḥrdḡtra-* 'roasting-pan' as the genuine phonetic continuant of *gt*; cf. the pure guttural in OPruss. *-birgo* 'cook'.

⁴ Where *ḡt* appears it is due to the mediation of the *j* (*gʸ*) forms common to the velar and pure guttural series.

Avestan.			Old Bulgarian.		
<k, č> s	<g (j)> z	{ ? <št> <št>	<k> s	<g> z	{ ? <st> ¹ <st>

27. Brugmann's derivation of ἀκέομαι from η + κεισ (: κεάζω) used of the 'incutting' of the surgeon is semantically neither more nor less likely than my own definition from the surgeon's 'stitching'. Is stitching what the word came to mean [cf. ἀκεσται, of 'menders' (of torn garments), and Aristotle used it of a spider mending her net], or what it originally meant? The Homeric usage is as follows: (1), of healing wounds Ε 448, Π 29, 523; Ε 402 (901) by application of salves; (2), of healing mental hurts Δ 36, Ι 507, Ν 115 (bis); γ 145, κ 69 (very general); (3) of patching up (or caulking) damaged boats ξ 383; (4), of quenching thirst χ 2; (5), ἄκος, as a general remedy for ills, Ι 250, and of sulphur as a purificatio against defilement, χ 481. So far as the Homeric usage admits of inference, the dressing and bandaging, if not stitching, of the surgeon and not his cutting must be thought of. There is neither semantic nor morphological obstacle in the way of recognizing a noun-stem *ἀκεσ—'stitch' (lit. 'puncture, prick of a needle'), cognate with Lat. *acus* 'needle' (from 'pricker'), as the source of a denominative *ἀκεσ-ye-ται (cf. ἀκειόμενος). In surviving ἄκος 'remedium',² we have, for the sense, at least, a deverbative, like Lat. *pugna*. The proper name Ἀκοή (v. Keil ap. Brugmann, op. cit., p. 289) is formed like Lat. *opera*: *opus*. If Homer does not specifically mention the stitching of wounds, the Egyptian development of medicine took place long before the transmission of the art to pre-Homeric

¹ Of late years Skr. *agra-m* has, on account of Av. *ayra-* (γ not z), been separated from the root *aj-* (Av. *as-*) 'agere'. But the definition as "das vorausgehende, und in diesem sinne (aber auch nur in diesem) die spitze" (Grassmann, Wtbch. z. R. V.) is not unsatisfying (cf. ἀγός 'leader'). This derivation may be maintained intact by supposing that **agro-* was the proper phonetic form, and that it alternated with **agēti* (with "g") securing, however, a certain semantic independence as **agēti* became restricted in the Iranian branch rather to the sense of 'drive'. Then in an apparently isolated word like Av. *vasra-* 'fustis' (: Skr. *vdjra-s* 'fulmen') the *s* is due to popular (but mistaken) association with *vas-* 'vehere' (cf. *vectis* 'crow-bar, [= brechstange] handspike'), while Skr. *vdjra-s* would owe its *j* (not *g*) to *vājdyati* 'calcaribus concitat, stimulat, instigat'. The root is also found in Lat. *vegeo* which need not for any semantic reason be separated from *augeo* (pace Walde s. v.), especially if Av. *vasra-* 'cudgel' has a secondary *z*.

² In apposition with ἑμμοτον 'lint' in Aesch. Choe. 471.

Greece. In so conservative an art it is something that Celsus (v. 26. 23) tells us of the stitching up of wounds with *acia* 'thread' (see Otto's Sprichwörter, s. v. *acus* for the proverbial use of *acus et acia*).

xi Eng. *bound, boundary*.

28. For Eng. *bound* a Celto-Latin **bodmā* is the probable startform. This is identical, as Thurneysen has suggested, with the startform whence comes OIr. *buden* 'band' (= company of soldiers, see § 3). The development of sense seems to me most simple. Any *band* that formed the 'trimming, border, binding' of a garment, or any rope that defined the ring of a game or combat, constituted a 'binding, bound, boundary'. This is all concretely attested in the English word *list* 'border-stripe; boundary' which, as I may remark in passing, has probably given rise to the "excrement" *t* of *lists* = Mid. Fr. *lisse*—as the "excrement" *d* of *bound* = OFr. *bonne* may be due to a reinforcement from Eng. *bound* (ptc. to *binds*). Generally comparable is *ιμάς* 'band, thong, strap': Skr. *śimānta-s*, *śimān-* 'Markung eines Dorfes'.

xii φοιτάω.

29. Brugmann's article referred to in paragraph 25 would support the gradation (*a*)*bhi*: *bhei-* by deriving φοιτάω from φοι + ιταω. If one must find *'bhi-* in Greek I would recommend him to operate with the Aristophanic future *φιαλῶ* 'incipiam', unless the word ἐφιάλτης 'night-mare, incubo' (with the byforms ἐπιάλτης ἐπιάλος) so clearly revealed derivation from *e)pi* + *sal-* (: Lat. *salit* 'leaps'). So Norden, ad Aen. 6, 570, connects Ἐφιάλτης with ἐφάλλεται. Thus *φιαλῶ* (with *φιαλ* from *πιηαλ-*) means *in-siliam* > *in-cipiam*.

30. An etymology of φοιτάω, to be satisfactory, must account for the picturesque or graphic quality of this word,¹ such moments as Liddell and Scott have tried to render by 'to stalk about, strut about, roam <rage, rave> about', cf. φοιτάλεος 'furens' = παράκοπος—in Hesychius who also glosses φοίτης by ὁ κῆρυξ. I would therefore derive φοιτάω directly from the root *bhēy-*, or rather from a noun-stem *bhōito-* (? φοίτης) meaning originally

¹ Reference may be made here to the preface of the Petersburg Lexicon wherein Böhtlingk and Roth especially deprecate the number of verbs that the commentators had defined by a colorless 'ire' or 'venire' (I, p. vi).

'beater'. I think particularly of a huntsman beating the woods. From the notion of 'beating' several contexts gain in point, e. g. β 182, ὄρνιθες . . . φοιτῶσι, of birds beating the air, Γ 449, ἀν' ὄμιλον ἐφοίτα θηρὶ εἰκώς, of Atrides, beating up <and down> his host like a wild beast at bay, N 760, φοῖτα ἀνὰ προμάχους διζήμενος εἴ που ἐφεύροι, of one beating up <and down> the battle line in search for a particular enemy, cf. Lys. 3, 29, ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμὴν οἰκίαν φοιτῶν εἰσὴν βία, where φοιτῶν, interpreted as from *bhē(y)*-, suggests Lat. 'pultans'.

31. On the general problem of the development of verbs of motion from the sense of 'striking' see AJP. 26, 198, especially noting M. Eng. *swappen* = 'to strike; go quickly'. So Eng. *strikes* and Germ. *streicht* (also reflexive) developed into verbs of motion—I say developed because I think they are plainly in error who reverse this semantic development (see also on ἐλαύνει, AJP. 26, 199). For φοιτάω of sexual activities (π 296), cf. Eng. *striker* and Germ. *streichen* (in Huntsman's language) of the rutting of animals. With the use of *streichen* = *migrare* (of birds), cf. β 182, above. In the renderings above, to *beat* the woods, to *beat* up and down (for prey), said also of a stag at bay (cf. Γ 449), to *beat* wing (β 182) have been already implied. To these may be added to *beat* up recruits (? or is this for 'drumming' up), and to *beat* a painful way. Bearing in mind the origin of φοιτάω in the chase we may ask if Lat. *ambire* = 'petere' (cf. *ambio ambiunt*, with *i*, not *e*) is not from *am[bhī]*- + *bhēy*-. Another cognate of φοιτάω would be *-bito*, with a by-form *beto* that exhibits dialectic *e* from a diphthong. Of course *b*- arose in a compound, not in the simplex.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

III.—THE DATE OF ARISTOPHANES' GEORGOI.

The word *μολγός*, which Aristophanes employed at least four times, is recorded for no other Greek writer except Dio Cassius, who uses it once. The literal meaning of the word, which probably belonged to the vulgar language, is reasonably certain, but its connotation in Aristophanes has been the subject of much discussion among scholars from the Alexandrians down. Furthermore, three of the four occurrences are preserved to us by ancient grammarians in brief quotations, without a sufficiently extensive context to enable us to form an independent judgment in each separate case, and in two instances in a corrupt context. I hope to show, however, that the four occurrences in Aristophanes are not so many distinct and independent instances of the use of the word, but that they all bear a very intimate relation to each other,—indeed, that they are all repetitions of or allusions to the same joke. When once this relationship is recognized there is some prospect of restoring the original text of two of the quotations, and of assigning to their source the two quotations from undesignated plays. The date of the *Georgoi* can then be more definitely fixed than heretofore.

We begin with the occurrence which we have in its full context, *Eq.* 960 ff.:

Παφ. μὴ δῆτά πώ γ', ὦ δέσποτ', ἀντιβολῶ σ' ἐγώ,
πρὶν ἂν γε τῶν χρησμῶν ἀκούσῃς τῶν ἐμῶν.
'Αλ. καὶ τῶν ἐμῶν νυν. Παφ. ἀλλ' εἰς τοῦτ' ἐμὴν πίθη,
μολγὸν γενέσθαι δεῖ σε. 'Αλ. κἂν γε τουτ' ἐμὴν,¹
ψωλὸν γενέσθαι δεῖ σε μέχρι τοῦ μυρρίνου.

The literal meaning of *μολγός* is given by Pollux 10. 187 (quoted below) and Hesychius² as *βόειος ἀσκός*. This definition is confirmed in the only passage in Greek literature in which the word is used in a literal sense, Dio Cassius 61. 16, II, p. 234

¹ Guarino of Favara 1270 (cited by Ribbeck) quotes this passage: *μολγὸν γενέσθαι· παρὰ τῷ Ἀριστοφάνει.*

² Among his definitions of the word in the *Knights* is the statement: *ἄλλοι δὲ "μολγόν" τὸν βόειον ἀσκόν.*

Bekker. In describing the indignation against Nero which prevailed among the Romans after the murder of Agrippina Dio states that some people *μολγόν τινα ἀπ' ἀνδριάντος αὐτοῦ νύκτωρ ἀπεκρέμασαν, ἐνδεικνύμενοι ὅτι ἐς ἐκείνον αὐτὸν δέοι ἐμβεβλήσθαι*. The specific punishment at Rome for parricides and matricides, here hinted at, was to sew them in a sack and drown them. *μολγός* in this passage is a contemptuous equivalent for *ἀσκός*. In the parallel account in Suetonius Vit. Ner. 45 *ἀσκός* was probably used for Dio's *μολγός*: *ἀσκός* praeligatus is Howard's probable restoration of the MS *ascopa deligata* (Harv. Stud., 1896, p. 208. *ascopera*, a conjecture which is usually accepted, is hardly the equivalent of *μολγός*). Suetonius adds that to the sack was attached the inscription "... tu culleum meruisti", culleum evidently being the Latin equivalent of the Greek word. Finally, the oracle which Aristophanes has perverted to his present purpose shows that *μολγός* has been substituted for *ἀσκός*, as modern editors of the poet have observed. Curiously the scholiasts, though they suspected a parody on some oracle, do not quote the original.¹ But Plutarch Vit. Thes. 24 (see also Paus. 1. 20. 4 and Libanius ad Dem. De fals. leg. 297) quotes two oracles given to Theseus in which it is predicted that he will be as an *ἀσκός*, viz.:

ἀσκός βαπτίζῃ, δῖναι δέ τοι οὐ θέμις ἐστί,

and

ἀσκός γὰρ ἐν οἰδατι ποντοπορεύσῃ.

So when Aristophanes sets the Paphlagonian to reciting oracles in order to keep the favor of Demus, for *ἀσκός* the inflated bag, symbol of that which rides the waves and never sinks (cf. Pindar's *φελλὸς ἀβάπτιστος* Pyth. 2. 80), he causes him to substitute *μολγός*, a leathern bag of another sort, "a contemptuous synonym" (Neil ad loc.), whose associations were in a lower sphere.

The oracle which prophesied that Theseus should be an *ἀσκός ἀβάπτιστος* was of course highly reassuring to the Athenians, but the phrase *ἀσκὸν γενέσθαι*, taken out of such a context, might, even without the substitution of *μολγός*, mean a totally different thing.

¹The original note, however, may have contained it. All the lexicographical notices on *μολγός* have been derived from a common source, and that an explanation of Eq. 963. The circumstance that Suidas, Pollux, and the present scholium each preserves a different quotation only indicates how difficult and complex is the problem of reconstructing the original note with our present means.

Solon's *ἤθελόν κε ἄσκον δεδάρθαι*, "to be skinned alive", has the flavor of a familiar or popular saying. "An inflated bag" is used by Epicharmus (fr. 246 Kb.) as a symbol of emptiness, *αὐτὰ φύσις ἀνθρώπων, ἄσκοι πεφυσσάμενοι*. And, lastly, *ἄσκος* = "wine-bag" could be used of a person in the meaning "guzzler", "tank", cf. Antiphanes 19 K. *τοῦτον οὖν δι' οἰνοφλυγίαν καὶ πάχος τοῦ σώματος "ἄσκον" καλοῦσι πάντες οὐπιχώριοι*.

μολγός also could carry any one of these objectionable implications, and perhaps, on account of its connection with *ἀμέλγειν* (cf. *βουμολγός*), still others. But the flattering connotation of *ἄσκος* in the oracle is certainly excluded in the situation in the Knights by the tenor of the passage, which is a threat. It is of the highest importance to the Paphlagonian to deter Demus from his intention of changing his chief-steward. He knows that Demus will not care to become a *μολγός*. These three interpretations are therefore open to us: 1) *μολγὸν δαρῆναι*. This would be peculiarly appropriate in the mouth of the tanner, who earlier (v. 369) has said to the Sausage-dealer *ἡ βύρσα σου θρανεύσεται*. The latter retorts *δερῶ σε θύλακον κλοπῆς*, cf. also Nub. 442 *τουτὶ τοῦμόν σῶμ' αὐτοῖσιν παρέχω . . . ἄσκον δείρειν*. This interpretation finds support also in the counter-threat of the Sausage-dealer, whose oracle prophesies for Demus a skinning *à outrance*. 2) = *οἰνόφλυξ*, the interpretation of Pollux. But the prospect would hardly be terrifying to Demus. 3) *μολγὸς πεφυσσάμενος*, in a) the Epicharmean sense = *κενός, μάταιος, κοῦφος*. This would not have been very effective as a threat or very funny as a joke, nor would b) "puffed up" with pride, a meaning which has been given to the word in fr. 964 K.¹ To these may be added a possible fourth which *μολγός*, but not *ἄσκος*, might have had, 4) = *ἀμελκτός*, "milked dry", the interpretation which underlies the *πένης* of the scholiast. For *ἀμέλγειν* in this sense cf. v. 326 *ἀμέλγεις τῶν ξένων τοὺς καρπίμους*. The objection to this is that it would be inappropriate in the mouth of the Paphlagonian, who has already been systematically cheating the people. Of these four interpretations the first is distinctly the best, and in the following discussion will be assumed to be correct. It is not necessary to suspect any obscene under-meaning in the phrase.²

¹ E. g., Bothe's interpretation of fr. 964 K.: "Noli Athenienses admodum laudare, ne superbia tumidi ut *μολγοί* fiant".

² Most modern editors since Küster have insisted upon the obscenity, though they do not agree in defining it. Küster merely remarks: "vel quod

Before passing to the consideration of the second passage it is well to observe, as regards the *μολγός*-oracle in the *Knights*, first, that after Demus has consented to listen to the oracles of the two rivals, the Paphlagonian does not recite this particular oracle, and, second, that in v. 963 he is quoting, though not literally, only the threat contained in it for disobedience to its injunctions, which are here not expressed, but only implied in *ἐὰν τούτῳ* (*Sausage-dealer*) *πίθῃ*. However, three of the oracles which he recites in 1015 ff. contain a stipulation similar to that which the *μολγός*-oracle was supposed to contain, viz., that Demus should make no change in the administration of his household; cf. v. 1017 *σφῆσθαί σ' ἐκέλευσ' ἱερὸν κύνα καρχαρόδοντα*, v. 1039 *τὸν* (i. e. *τὸν λείοντα*) *σὺ φυλάξαι*, v. 1052 *ἀλλ' ἱέρακα φίλει*. The first of these also contains a threat which corresponds to *μολγὸν γενέσθαι δεῖ σε* in v. 963, viz. in v. 1019 *κἂν μὴ δρᾷ* (or *δρᾷς*) *ταῦτ' ἀπολείται*.

The second occurrence of the word in Aristophanes is in a verse which is quoted by Pollux as a mock-oracle, and is, I believe, a portion of the oracle to which the Paphlagonian in the *Knights* is supposed to allude. The note of Pollux (10. 187) is: *ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ "ἀσκόν" καὶ "ἀσκίδιον" καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα προειρήκαμεν, οὐδὲν κωλύει καὶ "μολγόν" εἰπεῖν, ὅς ἐστι κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ταραντίνων γλῶτταν βόειος ἀσκός· ὅθεν καὶ Θεοδωρίδας τὸν Ἡφαιστον ἔφη φυσητῆρσι μολγίνοις χρῆσθαι καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ χρησμόν τινα παίζει* (fr. 964 K., II, p. 1066 M., fr. 865 Bl.),

μή μοι Ἀθηναίους αἰνεῖτε οἱ μολγοὶ ἔσονται,

τὸ ἀπληστον αὐτῶν ὑπαινιττόμενος.

The verse is an oracular hexameter, but unfortunately its text is not sound. The MSS give *αἰνεῖτε οἱ μολγοὶ*, *αἰνεῖτε ἀμολγοί* and *ἀνεῖται μολγοὶ*. If the leading verb was *αἰνεῖν*, Dindorf's correction *αἰνεῖθ', οἱ μολγοί* is the simplest. Bernhardt's *αἰνεῖν, μολγοὶ γάρ* departs too far from the MSS. Bekker's *αἰνεῖτ', ἧ* (adopted by

magis suspicor, obscoenitas quaedam latet, quam explicare pudor vetat". Brunck thought of "fellator", from the active *ἀμέλγειν*. But the passive "fellatus" would be more appropriate. If there is any obscenity here, it is surprising that the Greek grammarians did not detect it or even suspect it. Their interpretations are: *τυφλός*, *Μολγός* (ethnic), *πένης*, *κλέπτῃς* (from act. *ἀμέλγειν*), *ἀκμαῖος*, *γλαυκός*, *βραδύς*, *μοχθηρός*, *ἀπληστος*. Van Leeuwen favors the interpretation *μοχθηρός*: "quod autem voci ἀσκῶ his locis (i. e. in the ἀσκός-oracles) iocose substitutum est μολγός, inde efficio talem demum utrem, cuius corium esset attritum, μολγὸν esse dictum", the term being therefore applicable to bad men.

Bergk), in which *ἤ* must do duty for *εἰ δὲ μή* or *εἰ δέ*, is perhaps somewhat objectionable on this ground. But the vital objection to this verse, considered as a parody on the *ἄσκος*-oracle, in any of these versions, is in the sense which the verb *αἰνέειν* gives. An injunction "Praise not the Athenians, for they will be skinned alive" would manifestly have been of no advantage to Cleon, or to anybody like Cleon, in his struggle to retain his position of *προστάτης τοῦ δήμου*. The persons addressed should rather be admonished not to do to the Athenians a particular thing, then contemplated, on pain of the Athenians' being skinned alive if they do it. The persons addressed must therefore be personally interested in the welfare of the Athenians, i. e., some portion or class of the body politic. The speaker recites the oracle in order to make them give up their purpose or their policy. We must remember that the *μολγός*-oracle, whenever it occurs, is Cleon's oracle; therefore the persons addressed in this prohibition are the opponents of Cleon's policy. The word which an oracle whose intent was to deprecate a change of policy would be most likely to use is *κινεῖτε*,—*μή μοι Ἀθηναίους κινεῖθ'*, οἱ *μολγοὶ ἴσονται*,—if certain conditions are not fulfilled. Such an oracle recited in the interests of Cleon would contain the thought which we find in three of the Paphlagonian's oracles in the *Knights*, viz., *εἰ μὴ σώσσονται—τὸν Κλέωνα*.

The scholium to Eq. 963 preserves two lines from the *Georgoi* in which *μολγός* occurs: *ἄλλως. Σύμμαχος' ἴσκει χρησμός τις εἶναι. ἐν γὰρ τοῖς Γεωργοῖς οὕτως ἔχει* (fr. 101 K., II, p. 988 M., fr. 118 Bl.)

*ὅτφ δοκεῖ σοι δεῖν μάλιστα τῇ πόλει.
ἐμοὶ μὲν ἐπὶ τὸν μολγὸν εἶναι' οὐκ ἀκήκοας;*

Symmachus saw a direct allusion to an oracle in these lines, but as the text now stands there is nothing of the oracular about them, except the word *μολγός*. Brunck's correction of *ὅτφ* to *δτου* in the first verse has been accepted by everybody. An imperative like *λέγε* (*λέγ' δτου* Blaydes, *εἰπ' ἐμοί* Kock) is to be supplied. But the emendation of the second verse is still outstanding. The verse is usually quoted as it is, but without the *εἶναι*, which spoils the metre. Its excision is due to Porson. He assumed that a verb like *εἶναι* was to be supplied with the preceding phrase. In order to secure this word in the text Blaydes proposed to rewrite the end of the line: *λέν'. οὐ σοὶ δοκεῖ;* But even if *μολγός* could

have had a signification that would be appropriate in such an imprecation,—and this must be regarded as extremely doubtful,—there is absolutely no parallel for the phrase. Could a Greek have said *ἔλθ' ἐπὶ τὸν μολγόν*? Bergk's remedy, which has been widely adopted, is even less happy. He had the right interpretation of *μολγὸν γενέσθαι* = *ἀσκὸν δαρῆναι*, but he proposed to read *ἐμοὶ μὲν αἶνειν μολγόν*, observing that *αἶνειν*, a verb which has disappeared from our texts, is cited by the lexicographers in the meaning *πίσσειν*.¹ But the passive would be necessary for the sense he requires, as Herwerden (Nov. add. crit., p. 15) has pointed out. Herwerden himself has proposed the only reading so far suggested that has the merit of conveying an allusion to the mock-oracle and of conforming to the usage which is attested for *μολγός* in the other three passages,—two essential prerequisites of any restitution of the line. His proposal *ἐμοὶ μὲν εἶναι μολγόν*, however, is open to the objection that it does not explain the origin of the error. It would be difficult to think of a palaeographical process that could have transformed so simple and lucid a phrase as *εἶναι μολγόν* into the unintelligible *ἐπὶ τὸν μολγόν εἶναι*. On the other hand, the presence of *εἶναι* after *μολγόν* in the MSS can readily be accounted for on the assumption that it was inserted, after the preceding words had become corrupt, by one who recognized that the usual construction of *μολγός* is with a verb of being or becoming. The seat and source of the corruption are to be sought in the three words *μὲν ἐπὶ τόν*, which break sharply with Aristophanic usage as regards *μολγός*, destroy any possibility of there being here an allusion to an oracle, and are in the context unintelligible.

I believe that Aristophanes wrote *ἐμοί; γενέσθαι μολγόν· οὐκ ἀκήκοας*; The corruption dates from the time when the words were not divided or punctuated. The graphical similarity of ΓΕΝ and ΜΕΝ, the scribe's inclination to see the familiar collocation *ἐμοὶ μὲν*, and the carelessness of the script, were all contributing causes of the initial corruption, and the similarity in writing of ΕC and ΕΠ, of ΘΑΙ and ΟΝ did the rest.

The meaning of the passage now becomes clear. A certain person puts to another a question similar in intent to that which Dionysus propounds to Aeschylus and Euripides in *Ran.*

¹ Bergk assigned fr. 964 K. to the second Peace solely because Eustathius cites *αἶνειν* from that play.

1420; cf. 1435, where he seeks some γνώμην περὶ τῆς πόλεως σωτηρίας. The answer is a direct allusion to Cleon's mock-oracle. "What do I think? That she is to become a μολγός. Haven't you heard about it?" The speaker may then go on to quote the oracle, of which one verse has been discussed above.

The fourth instance of μολγός in Aristophanes is a brief quotation in Suidas s. v. It seems to have been overlooked by the collectors of the fragments of Aristophanes, perhaps under the impression that it is only a free rendering of the passage in the Knights.¹ But it is clearly an independent quotation. After giving some definitions, all of which are in the scholium to Eq. 963, Suidas adds: 'Αριστοφάνης' μολγὸν σε ποιήσω. This has the appearance of being either a threat by Cleon or a retort made by some person to a speaker who has just used the word μολγός. The latter is the more probable. As a retort the phrase is equivalent to the familiar ἐς κεφαλὴν σοί. Now it is natural to assume that this retort was closely associated with one of the two occurrences of the word which we have just discussed, with either fr. 964 or with fr. 101. Possibly the first speaker in fr. 101, indignant that his interlocutor should express the wish, or the prophecy, that Athens should become a μολγός, turns upon him with the threat μολγὸν σε ποιήσω, whereupon the second speaker attempts to justify himself by explaining that he was not giving his own opinion but was merely referring to Cleon's oracle, which he then proceeds to quote.

The assumption that these three passages are from the same play, the Georgoi, cannot in the nature of the case be rigorously demonstrated, but the joke is of so unusual a kind and so peculiarly appropriate at any time during the short period of Cleon's greatest power, that such an assumption appears to be entirely reasonable. Aristophanes would have been less likely to repeat this jest in three or four different plays than in two, and these two would not be far apart. The fact, then, that these three quotations readily and naturally weave themselves into an intelligible relation to each other may not improperly be considered a good reason for placing them together in the Georgoi.² As regards their position in the play, I would suggest that they are

¹ It is not listed in Bernhardt's Index to his edition of Suidas, among the references to quotations from Aristophanes unaccompanied by titles.

² Brunck assigned fr. 964 to Georgoi.

probably from the prologue, and that this prologue was similar to those in the *Knights*, *Wasps*, and *Peace*,—a scene between two persons, one of whom plays the clown or βωμολόχος. On this hypothesis the following arrangement is tentatively proposed:

A.

[ἐμοὶ λέγε]

[101 K.]

δτον δοκεῖ σοι δεῖν μάλιστα τῇ πόλει.

B. (βωμολόχος)

ἐμοί; γενέσθαι μολγόν. οὐκ ἀκήκοας;

A.

μολγόν σὲ πώσω.¹

[new frag.]

B.

(μηδαμῶς· λέγω γὰρ κατὰ τὸν χρησμόν, ὃν ᾔδει ἐκάστοτε ὁ Κλέων).

“μή μοι Ἀθηναίους κενεῖθ’, οἱ μολγοὶ ἔσονται,

[964 K.]

(εἰ μὴ) σώσονται τὸν νῦν προστάτην, κτλ.)”

What is the chronological relation of the *Georgoi* to the *Knights*? In which play did Aristophanes employ the motif of the μολγός-oracle first? The answer is given by Plutarch Vit. Nic. 8. After telling how Nicias resigned his generalship to Cleon (in the spring of 425), he states that this act brought great reproach upon Nicias and made him the butt of comic jests. He then quotes from the *Georgoi* four lines (fr. 100 K.)² in which the incident is specifically referred to. Now at the first dramatic contest following the Pylos episode, Lenaea 424, Aristophanes produced the *Knights*. The *Georgoi* could therefore not have been brought out before the Dionysia of that year. So far all scholars have been in agreement. Bergk favored the Dionysia of 424, Zielinski and Zelle the Lenaea of 423, the year of the *Clouds*.³ The intimate connection of the *Georgoi* with the

¹ For similar impatient protests against the clown's tiresome fooling, cf. e. g., Plut. 180, Καρ. ὁ Τιμοθέου δὲ πύργος—Χρ. ἐμπέσοι γέ σοι, *ibid.* 279 διαρραγείης, and see Süss, *De pers. ant. com. Att. usu atque orig.*, p. 91.

² In v. 2 the MSS give ἐπεὶ δίδωμι χιλίας δραχμάς, ἐάν με τῶν ἀρχῶν ἀφήτε; for ἐπεὶ we should perhaps read λέγ', εἰ. Kock proposed τί δ' εἰ.

³ Zielinski, *Gliederung*, p. 106, Zelle, *De com. Graec. . . . temp. defin.*, pp. 24 ff. Zielinski's argument is based upon the assumption, probably correct, that sycophants were assailed in the *Georgoi*. It is therefore, he argues, this play to which Aristophanes refers in Vesp. 1037 ff. φησὶν τε μετ' αὐτοῦ (Κλέωνος) τοῖς ἡπιάλοις ἐπιχειρῆσαι πέρυσιν καὶ τοῖς πυρετοῖσιν. Now while I believe that Zielinski and other scholars are right in thinking that the poet refers to the play which he had brought out at the Lenaea of 423 (and not to the

Knights, indicated by the employment in both of a very distinctive idea, strongly and, in my opinion, conclusively, turns the scales in favor of the earlier date. At the Dionysia of 424 Aristophanes did not come off victor. On account of the Victors'-list IG. II 977 d, e (Wilhelm, p. 107, cf. A. J. P. XXVIII 195), that place must be given to Eupolis, whose play was probably the *Πάεις*. Aristophanes had won a victory at the Dionysia the year before, 425. By the definitive assignment of the Georgoi to the Dionysia of 424 the problem of dating the other plays which certainly belong to the years between the Babylonians and the Peace is considerably simplified.¹

The characterization of Cleon as an unscrupulous dealer in oracles, which he is represented as having manufactured for the furtherance of his demagogic purposes,² is a motif which Aristophanes amplified in the Knights, but probably only touched upon incidentally in the Georgoi. The prominence which the poet gives it in the former play shows the enthusiasm of the young poet for the new idea which he has just conceived. The keynote is struck in the exposition, v. 61, where we are told of Cleon ᾄδει δὲ χρησμούς· ὁ δὲ γέρων σιβυλλίᾳ. Shortly afterwards one of the slaves who are plotting to oust Cleon from his position conceives the idea of stealing Cleon's oracles (v. 209). One of these oracles predicts Cleon's downfall. After the discovery of the Sausage-dealer, it is this oracle which convinces him that he is called to a high destiny (vv. 194 ff.). In v. 818 he roundly accuses Cleon before Demus of trying to injure Athens by means of his oracles. When Demus is on the point of removing Cleon, Cleon gets the decision postponed by intimating that it will be greatly to Demus' advantage to hear his oracles first (vv. 960 ff.). The oracle-motif culminates in the scene vv. 997-1110, in which Cleon recites oracle after oracle, but in vain. And finally, in

Clouds, as Wilamowitz recently asserts, Sitzungsber. Berl. Akad., 1911, p. 469; see also E. S. Thompson Cl. Rev. IX, 1895, p. 307), we know too little about the other lost plays which were brought out in this period to assert that in one or another of them, as well as in the Georgoi, an attack was *not* made upon the sycophants.

¹ I expect to revert to this subject in the near future, in connection with a fresh discussion of Aristophanes' relations with his didascali. I may say here, however, that I believe, with Wilamowitz, that the *Δράματα ἢ Κένταυρος* is to be assigned to the Lenaea of 426, the *Ὀλκάδες* to the Lenaea of 423.

² The process is explained by Ameipsias in the *Κόνηος* (Dionysia 423), fr. 10 K. ὥστε ποιῶντες χρησμούς· αὐτοὶ διδάσκει ᾄδειν Διοπεῖθει κτλ.

vv. 1229 ff., Cleon, completely crushed, yields to the inevitable when he learns that his "Pythian oracle" clearly points to Agoracritus as his successor.

Two months later, while these scenes were still fresh in the memories of the Athenians, the poet comes back to the subject. The reference to the *μολγός*-oracle in the *Georgoi* is in reality a back-reference to Eq. 963. But no extensive use was now made of this topic. So far as we know Cleon did not appear as a speaking character in the *Georgoi*. There is every reason to believe, however, that he was assailed. The comedy was an appeal for peace, like the *Acharnians* and *Peace*, and no comedy of this period which advocated the policy of conciliation, at the time when Cleon, unduly elated by his success at *Sphacteria*, set himself obstinately against any reasonable understanding with Sparta, could have left Cleon unscathed. The writer of the first hypothesis to the *Peace* justly observes concerning Aristophanes' peace-comedies: *καὶ πανταχοῦ τοῦτο (peace) ἐσπούδακεν, τὸν δὲ Κλέωνα κομψῶν τὸν ἀντιλέγοντα καὶ Λάμαχον τὸν φιλοπόλεμον ἀεὶ διαβάλλον.* We chance to know that Lamachus was ridiculed in the *Georgoi* (fr. 106 K.), and cannot doubt that Cleon also came in for his share of abuse. When Aristophanes promises in the exposition of the *Wasps* (vv. 62 ff.)

*οὐδ' εἰ Κλέων γ' ἐλαμψε τῆς τύχης χάριν,
αὐθις τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα μυττωτεύσομεν,*

the *μυττώσεις* to which he refers, while more especially that administered in the *Knights*, may well include that in the *Georgoi* also.¹ The poet simply promises that Cleon is not to be the theme of the *Wasps*.

EDWARD CAPPS.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

¹*αὐθις* cannot be restricted to the meaning "a second time"; it often means "once again". Plato Rep. 532 d *αὐθις πολλάκις ἐπανιτέον*, "again and again". Wilamowitz, l. c., p. 466, in order to restrict to the *Knights* the reference in the *Wasps*, unduly limits the meaning of the adverb, and his construction of *τῆς τύχης χάριν* with the following seems to me strained.

IV.—A SLAVIC ANALOGY TO VERNER'S LAW.

Interchange of voiced and unvoiced consonants in "root doublets" as well as in root determinatives and suffixes is a frequent phenomenon. But while instances like I. E. **sk(h)ei-* : **sk(h)eid-*, on the one hand, and *-to-* : *-do-*, or *-go-* : *-go-* on the other hand, are common enough, a definite phonetic formula for this interchange (restricted to spirants) has so far been found only for the Germanic languages, namely, Verner's Law.

In presenting some traces of a possibility of a similar phonetic principle in the Slavic languages, I am fully aware of two important facts; first, that the connection between I. E. accent and this interchange as illustrated in the meager number of examples presented below is by no means firmly established; second, that the interchange is not limited to spirants. For the first shortcoming, our present imperfect knowledge of I. E. accent as represented in Slavic may serve as a partial excuse; as to the second point, I hope to show in a forthcoming paper on the phonetic aspects of the Germanic soundshifting that the Germanic restriction of the law to spirants is only casual, and not an inherent phonetic necessity.

The material I am able to submit at present is incomplete, and rather an illustration than a conclusive evidence.

I. p : b (bh).

Slavic (in most cases, the Slavic forms are quoted according to Berneker, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*) *drapati* : *drabъ*; Russ. *dr'apatъ*, 'scratch, bite', perhaps connected with **drasati* < **drap-sati*, Boh. *drasta*, 'splinter, rag, dress'¹—Boh. *z-draby*, 'rags' (Lith. *dróbė*, 'linen, sheet', Lett. *drēbe*, 'cloth, dress'. Perhaps also Bulg. *dripa* 'rag, outworn dress', **dripati* 'tear', *droba*, 'fraction, fragment', **drobiti*, 'break up'. Compare Goth. *ga-draban* 'aushauen', O. E. *drepan*, 'hit', etc.?

¹ Berneker, *Et. WB*, from which a large number of the given etymologies are taken.

glabokъ : *glupъ* ; O. Bg. *glabokъ* 'deep', Gk. γλύφω, 'excavate', L. *glubo*, 'peel', O. H. G. *klioban* 'split'. Russ. *glupъ*, 'deaf', etc. The latter are taken as borrowings (common Slavic) from Germ. **glopa-*, 'idiot'; but the development of meaning from 'deep, hollow' to 'deaf, stupid' presents no great difficulties. Perhaps **globa*, 'grief' may be connected.

O. B. *chapati* 'bite' : O. B. *chabiti*, 'spoil, harm'; Uhlenbeck sees in the former a Germanic loan word (Dutch *happen*), while Berneker considers it an independent sound imitation in Slavic.

O. B. *sypati* 'pour, scatter'; Russ. *ŭbatъ*, 'throw'. I. E. root doublet **sueip-*, **sueib-*, Walde, Lat. Et. Wb., *dissipo*.

II. t : d (dh).

O. B. *badati*, 'pierce', Serv. *bàdalj*, 'Stecken zum Antreiben eines Tiers'—O. B. *batъ*, 'oak stick', *batati* 'beat'. Perhaps to Lat. *con-futo* 'schlage nieder', O. H. G. *Batu-* 'Kampf'.—O. B. *bosti* (*bodq*) 'stechen, schlagen (besonders mit den Hörnern)', Lat. *fodio*, 'dig' are hardly connected.

gadati 'meinen'—*gatati* 'vermuten'.

cěditi 'absehen, klären', to I. E. root doublet **sk(h)ei-d-*, *t-*.

gnětiti, 'anfachen' (Zunder) : *gnědъ* 'brown'; As to development of meaning, compare Lat. *nidor*, 'Qualm', Walde, Lat. E. W., 412 f.

brotъ 'Färberröte'—*brudъ* 'Schmutz'. Possible connections of the former given by Berneker.

godъ 'year, fitting time', connected with words denoting suitability, pleasure, etc. (see Berneker), perhaps to Goth. *gōþs* 'good', might be connected with *gotovъ* 'ready, finisht', which is usually connected with Goth. **ga-taws* (Mikosich, Uhlenbeck; Berneker rejects the connection and rather thinks of Alb. *gat* 'bereit').

gatъ 'Gewürm, Schlange' (O. P. *gidan* 'Scham')—*gata* 'Hode'.

jedinъ 'one', *jedva* 'hardly', may well belong to Gk. ἕτε, L. *et*, Skr. *āti*, etc.; *inъ* < **oinos*, while the first element of *jedinъ* may have either intensifying or adding meaning: 'just one' or 'one more'.—*-va* demonstrative suffix, 'just so', see Berneker.

gospodъ 'master' which has not yet been satisfactorily explained, may well be connected with I. E. **potis* 'master'; Berneker 236.

Suffix *-to-* appears in I. E. accented and unaccented; *-do-*, rather rare otherwise, is surprisingly frequent in Slavic; similarly, *-dlo-* (*-dhlo-*?) has, in Slavic, taken largely the place of the *-tro-*, *-tlo-* suffix. E. g.:

čedo 'child', usually considered a Germanic loan word. Berneker; "Ob nicht ein zufälliger Gleichklang täuscht? Vielleicht gehört č. mit formans *-do-* zu *čьnq*, *četi* als "Empfängnis, Leibesfrucht"; vgl. zur gleichen Wurzel ai. *kanyā*, *kanā* 'Mädchen', etc.

čudo 'wonder', to L. *caveo* < **coveo*; with **qouptom* compare O. B. *čuti*, 'feel', Serv. *čuvati* 'guard'. The same connection is made by Walde, L. E. W. 107, while Berneker refers to Gk.

crěda 'herd' may be borrowed from Germanic (Goth. *hairda*, etc.), but may be Slavic, from **qer-* at the side of **k̑er-*.

gordъ, O. B. *gradъ* 'city', etc., need not be borrowed from Germanic, but may be connected both with Goth. *gards*, etc., and with L. *hortus*, Gk. *χόρος* on the basis of **ghortó-s*; Lith. *gaĩdas* and *šaĩdis* do not speak against this since "Phrygisch und Albanesisch zeigen, dass hier idg. *ǵh* und *gh* wechseln" (Berneker).

Other words with *-do-* suffixes are given by Meillet, *Études sur l'Étymologie*, 319 ff.

For the *-dlo-* (*-dhlo-*?) suffix compare, e. g., *bydlo* 'dwelling', but Lith. *buklas* 'Lager eines Tiers'.

-tro- : *-dro-* in *qtro*, *ętro* 'intestines', *ędro* 'bosom'.

III. k : g (gh).

blagъ 'starrköpfig', to I. E. **m̑lagó-*, Gk. *βλακός* 'schlaff, lässig', Lat. *flaccus* 'welk, schlaff'.

braga 'Maische' : Ir. *braich*.

bergъ 'shore, slope', is considered 'urslavische Entlehnung aus dem Germanischen' (Berneker); may be cognate with it through I. E. **bherqó-* (but Av. *barəso*, Arm. *barjr* point to *ǵh*).

drogъ 'pole, beam' : *drokъ* 'Stössel, Traubenstössel'. Berneker compares the first with O. N. *drangr* 'Stange, die aus der Erde ragt', the latter he considers a sound variation of L. *truncus*.

dьrkati 'gleiten' : *dьrgati* 'ziehen, zupfen, reiben'.

mnogъ 'much' often considered a loan word from Germanic (Got. *manags*); rather to I. E. **mon-oqó-*.

možь 'man' from I. E. **mon-ǵiō* (compare Got. *mannisks*).

IV a. s : z.

That Slav. *s* with the accent following can become *z* (especially in the combination *-sn-* has been shown by Zupitza, KZ. 37, 369 f. and Uhlenbeck KZ. 39, 599 f. In addition to the instances given there I wish to mention:

bez- : *bes-*, *raz-* : *ras-*, *iz-* : *is-*, *vъs-* : *vъz* cannot always be explained by assimilation, but I should rather think of such accent differences as in Gk. *χαρίς*—*αἴς*. Cf. Meillet, l. c., 153 f.

česati 'kämmen, abstreifen' : *čeznoli* 'verschwinden, erlöschen'.

čsъnъ 'Licht, Lichtung' : *čzъ* 'flache Stelle am Ufer'.

dreska 'splinter' : *drezga* 'faggots'.

kosa 'hair' : *koša* 'skin' (suffix *-iō-*); also *koza* 'goat' may be related, see Walde, EW. under *cohus*.

prazъ 'ram' : O. B. *prasę* 'pig' (L. *porcus*).

IV b. s -ch : z -g.

In Slavic, *s* becomes *ch* after *u*, *i*, *r*, *k*. If a change from *s* to *z* had taken place, it is reasonable to suppose that this *z*, under the same or similar conditions, shifted to the corresponding voiced spirant, for which the spelling would doubtlessly be *g*. We may, therefore, be prepared to find an occasional change from *s* to *ch* or *g*, or from *ch* to *g* or *z*. Moreover, such an interchange is not necessarily restricted to the preceding sounds above mentioned, but at least its possibility must be admitted also after other sounds. Vondrák, Slav. Gr. 350 says: "Es gibt aber zahlreiche Fälle mit *ch* aus *s*, bei denen diese Bedingungen nicht vorhanden sind. So können wir auch hier die Erscheinung beobachten, dass ein neu aufgekommener Laut über die Grenzen seiner ursprünglichen Berechtigung greift". Still, until further proof is given, instances in which *s* > *ch* appears after other sounds must be accepted with caution. Included among the sounds requiring the regular change are the diphthongs and their phonetic developments, but also unaccented *o* which frequently falls together with *u* may have had the same effect.

grěchъ 'sin' : *grěza* 'confusion'. *grěchъ* belongs to stems with *s*, e. g., *grěso* 'I sin'; it is often connected with *grěje* 'warm, burn' (Böhtlingk, Miklosich, Pedersen, see Berneker, l. c., 351, where it is referred to Gk. *χρίω*). *grěza* is unexplained.

slyšati 'hear' : *sluga* 'servant'. The former belongs to **kley-*, with determinative *-s-*; the latter, I believe, belongs to the same stem (as "der Hörige"); Walde, with Žubaty, AfSPh, XV 479, connects it with Ir. *sluagh* 'army, crowd'.

gasiti 'extinguish' : *-gaga* 'thirst'?

drusati 'shake' : *drъgati* 'tremble'.

duxati 'push, crowd, rush' : *duchъ* 'spirit'? Osten-Sacken IF 22, 314.

bogъ 'god' : *бѣсъ* 'demon'; the first is considered a loan word from Iranian (perhaps Scythian), but may be connected with *бѣсъ* on the basis of an I. E. **bho(ǵ)d-so-* (**bhod-só-* : **bhóid-so-*).

-go, ending of the G. S. M., N. of the pronominal declension (*togo*, etc.) is a riddle; Vondrák, Sl. Gr. II 90 considers it an emphatic particle (Skr. *gha*), but I should rather take it as a development from I. E. *-so*, compare Pruss. *s-tesse*, or the Slavic interrogative, genitive *česo*, *čъso*. Development from **to-só* to **to-go* is probable if *s* > *ch* after unaccented *o* is admissible, but a number of analogical formations would have to be supposed for forms like *čъso* instead of **čъgo*, *jego* instead of **jeso* or **jezo*.

E. PROKOSCH.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

V.—TAGALOG VERBS DERIVED FROM OTHER PARTS OF SPEECH.

The fact that verbs may be made from other parts of speech is of course familiar to all students of linguistics. In any language numerous instances occur of denominative verbs, or verbs made from substantives or nouns. For example we have in English "to seed raisins", "to book an order", "to bottle wine", "to paper a room", etc.;¹ in German *herbergen* 'to shelter' from *Herberge*; *beauftragen* 'to commission' from *Auftrag*; *ratschlagen* 'to take counsel' from *Ratschlag*, *stolziren* 'be proud' from *stolz*, etc.; in French *avantager* 'to favor' from *avantage*, *badigeonner* 'to white-wash' from *badigeon*, *marchander* 'to haggle, hesitate' from *marchand*, *nigauder* 'to play the fool' from *nigaud*, etc.; and so in other languages.

Other parts of speech are also occasionally used as the basis of verbal forms. For example Shakespeare says "but me no buts", "if me no ifs"; in some languages a verb is made from the pronoun of the second person singular meaning to use 'thou' in speaking to, e. g., "to thou" (in Shakespeare), German *dutzen*, French *tutoyer*, etc.; in Sanskrit from *katham* 'how'? is formed *katháyati* 'to tell the how of, relate';² in Biblical Hebrew there are several verbs which are apparently derived from particles, e. g., *bē* 'to enter, come' is probably connected with the preposition *be* 'in', *hithmahmah* 'to delay, hesitate' is perhaps made from a reduplicated form of *mah* 'what'? meaning literally 'to say what';³ in the Modern Hebrew spoken by many Jews at the present day, particularly in Russia,

¹ In colloquial English it is possible to turn practically any noun into a verb without derivative ending.

² Cf. Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar, 3d ed., Boston, 1896, p. 387, § 1056.

³ Cf. Professor Haupt's paper, Semitic verbs derived from particles in the American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Vol. XXII, No. 4, 1906, p. 259.

a number of similar verbs occur, e. g., *'iizek* 'to qualify' from *'ek* 'how'? *him'ta* 'do frequently' from *me'ad* 'very, much', etc.¹

Aside from proper denominatives, however, that is to say, verbs made from real nouns, these formations in both the Indo-European and Semitic families of speech are exceptional and isolated phenomena, often verging on the facetious, as in the case of Shakespeare's verbal 'if' and 'but'.

The case is quite different in the Malayo-Polynesian family of speech, comprising, roughly speaking, the languages of the Brown or Malay race which inhabits the islands of the Pacific. Here the verbalizing power has sustained a remarkable development. Not only nouns, but practically any part of speech may be verbalized, and this not only in exceptional instances under each part of speech, but in the case of almost every word in every speech category. The present paper has to do with this peculiar development in Tagalog, the chief language of the Philippine Islands.

It may be laid down as a general rule that practically any word in Tagalog is capable of being used as the basis of verbal forms.

In the case of nouns, the power of verbalization does not differ much from that which we find in some other languages, English for example, but even here verbalization is carried to greater lengths than in any language with which I am familiar, not only simple but also derivative nouns being used as verbal roots. Some examples will make this evident.

The prefix *pala* combined with roots makes nouns that denote persons given to more or less disreputable practices, e. g., *palainum* 'drunkard' from *inum* 'drink', *palasumpâ* 'a profane person' from *sumpâ* 'curse', etc. These nouns may be verbalized in various ways, *palainum* with verbal prefix *mag* makes *magpalainum* 'be a drunkard', *palasumpâ* with change of initial *p* to *m* makes *malasumpâ* 'to be addicted to cursing and swearing'. Nouns denoting instrument are formed from roots by prefixing the particle *pan*, e. g., *pamalo* 'hammer' for *pan* + *palo*.² Such nouns may be verbalized in the passive with the particle *in*, e. g., the sentence 'make a hammer out of this iron'

¹ These are a few of the number of departicular verbs in Modern Hebrew collected by Dr. Aaron Ember of Johns Hopkins University.

² *Pan-palo* > *pam-palo* > *pam-malo* > *pamalo*.

may be rendered *pamalóin mo itó-ng bákal* 'let this iron be enhammered by thee'. The ordinary adjective in Tagalog is made by prefixing *ma* to a root, e. g., *mabúti* 'good' from *búti*. From such adjectives verbs are formed by prefixing *mag*, meaning to pretend to be what the root indicates, e. g., *magmabúti* 'to pretend to be good'. Similar formations are made from other derivative nouns and adjectives.

Some very interesting verbal forms are made from pronouns. From the genitive case of the personal pronouns both active and passive verbs are made in the sense of to consider or regard as mine, thine, etc. For example the sentence 'I shall consider it mine' is rendered by the future *in* passive of *ákin*, the genitive of the pronoun of the first person, viz., *aakinin ko* literally 'it shall be held as mine by me'.

A great number of very idiomatic expressions are made from the interrogative pronoun *anó* 'what'? For example 'what are you doing'? is *nagaanó ka* (*anó* verbalized with *mag*) literally 'thou art whating'? : 'what are you doing to that boy'? is *inaanó* (*in* passive of *anó*) *mo yaóng bátà*, literally 'thou art whating the boy'? : 'what will happen to him' is *mapapaanó siyá* (*anó* verbalized by *mapa* denoting change of condition) literally 'he will become what, pass into what'?

From *sino* 'who'? are made verbal forms which are used in such expressions as 'who do you think he is'? the pronoun denoting the person in question being made the subject, and *sino* being verbalized in the *in* passive of the *mag* class. The above expression is rendered *pinagsisino mo siyá*, literally 'he is considered who by thee'?

Passing on to the numerals we find a great number and variety of verbal forms based on them. Of these I shall mention only a few. Any cardinal may be verbalized with the particles *um* or *magin* in the sense of become, reach, arrive at, e. g., 'two will come' may be rendered *dumalawá* (*dalawá* 'two' with *um*) *ang paroroon*, literally 'will reach two those who will come'.

With the verbal particle *mag* active and passive verbs are made on the basis of the cardinals with the meaning of make into so many parts, e. g., 'divide this into five parts' is *paglimahin* (*in* passive of *mag* class of *limá* 'five') *mo itó*, literally, 'this be thy fiving-object'.

The ordinals make *in* passives with the meaning of to be placed in such and such a position in a series, e. g., 'I will make

him fifth' is *ikalilimahin* (*in* passive of *ikalimá* 'fifth') *ko siyá*, literally 'he will be fifthed by me'.

From the distributives with prefixed *tig* meaning so many to each, verbs are made in the *in* passive of the *mag* class, e. g., 'let each one have a banana' is *papagtigisahin* (*in* passive of *mag* class of *tigisá* 'one each') *mo silá nang ságing*, literally 'let them be one-eached by thee with bananas'.

Some very important and common verbs are made from adverbs. The verbs of motion 'come' and 'go' are made on the basis of the adverbs *díto* 'here' and *doón* 'there' respectively with the verbal prefix *pa* which denotes motion, viz., *paríto* 'come', *paroon* 'go', the *d* of the adverbs changing to *r* when it becomes intervocalic.

Adverbs meaning 'thus, in this manner', of which there are a number made from the demonstrative pronouns by prefixing *ga*, e. g., *gaitó*, *ganitó*, from the demonstrative *itó* 'this', may form *in* passives, e. g., 'make it like this' is *gaitóhin mo* literally 'be it thused by thee'.

Closely akin to this verbalizing of adverbs is the verbalizing of phrases consisting of the particle *sa*, which denotes the oblique case (a case including dative, locative, instrumental, and ablative) + a noun or pronoun. For example *lánġit* means 'heaven', *sa lánġit* means 'in heaven'; this phrase derived with the verbal particle *um*, viz., *sumalánġit* means 'to be in heaven'. This verb is used at the beginning of the Tagalog version of the Lord's Prayer, viz., *amá náming* 'our father who' *sungmasalánġit ka* 'art in heaven thou'. The word *ámin* means 'us', *sa ámin* means 'to us'; with the prefix *mapa* we have a verb *mapasaámin* meaning 'come to us,' which verb is likewise employed in the Lord's Prayer, viz., *mapasaámin* 'may come to us' *kaharián mo* 'kingdom thy'.

Occasionally we find phrases other than those made with *sa* used as the basis of verbal forms. Statements of so and so many days may be verbalized by the particle *magin* in the sense of to be so and so many days ago, e. g., *manġá iláng áraw* means 'some days', *maging-manġá-iláng-áraw* means 'it reaches some days at this time' or 'some days ago'.

The examples I have just cited are but a few of the many that might have been brought forward. Here in Tagalog, and the same is true generally speaking of other Philippine languages, and indeed of Malayo-Polynesian languages in general, the verbaliz-

ing power, which rarely gets beyond the limits of the category of nouns in other groups of speech, has so to speak run wild, including within the range of its operations not only all parts of speech, but practically every word in the language. Just as inflection may be regarded as a characteristic of the Indo-European family of speech, and internal vowel change, as a characteristic of the Semitic languages, so this extensive power of verbalization may be regarded as one of the most salient features of the Malayo-Polynesian family.

FRANK R. BLAKE.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

VI.—ASOKAN MISCELLANY.

I. MUNISA-.

I note with great pleasure that Professor Wackernagel, in his article 'Indoiranica' (ZvergSp. 43) p. 297, in a footnote, remarks "Mi. *munisa-* neben *manusa-* usw. ist gewiss eine Nachbildung nach *purisa-*". Though I anticipated him in this (see IF. 23, pp. 254–256; JAOS. 30, p. 90, footnote 3), he arrived at this conclusion quite independently, which confirms my conjecture.

2. KALSĪ *punā*.

Formerly (IF. 23, p. 260) I thought that Kālsī *punā* should be united with Prākṛit *uṇā* from **punāt* (see Pischel, Gr., § 342 near the end). It is objectionable to assume for Middle Indic words and forms prototypes other than for the correspondents in Sanskrit unless the phonetics of the Middle Indic dialects demand them; and in this particular instance it is especially easy to follow the Sanskrit. *Punā* (Pkt. *uṇā* is a later development of this due to specific Pkt. phonetics) is simply an analogical extension of *punā* in such combinations as *punā ramale* = *punar + ramale*.

3. A COUPLE OF NOTES ON THE 5TH ROCK-EDICT.

The fifth sentence of the Gīrnār redaction of this edict runs: *Ta mama pulā ca potrā ca param ca tena ya me apacam āva samvaṭṭakapā anuvatisare tathā so sukaṭam kāsati*. Now *so—kāsati* (singulars) are manifestly unsuitable. Plurals are surely called; witness the respective correspondents of the Shāhbāzgarhi, Kālsī, and Dhāuli redactions: *te sukaṭ[ra]m kaṣamti*, *se sukaṭam kachamti*, *se (suka) ṭam kach(am)ti*. The truth is that Gīrnār *so—kāsati* is a corruption due to *so—kāsati* of the next sentence: *Yo tu eta desam pi hāpesati so dukaṭam kāsati*, in which *so—kāsati* is perfectly correct; cf. Shb. *so [du]kaṭam kaṣati*, K. *se dukaṭam kachati*, Dh. *se (d)ukaṭam kach(a)ti*. On such faulty assimilations see Lanman, Album-Kern, p. 303 and on AV. 18.4.87.

We have a similar error in Kālsī [*hā*]pa[*y*]isamti in the sentence: *E cu hetā desam pi[hā]pa[y]ayisamti se dukaṭam kachati*, as is shown by Gīrnār *hāpesati*, Shb. [*hāpeṣati*], Dh.

hāpayisat(i). The plural for singular is due to the plurals *anuvāṣiṣamti*, *kachamti* of the preceding sentence [Shb. *an. vatiṣamti*, *kaṣamti*; G. *anuvatisare*; Dh. *anuvatisamti(i)*, *kach(am)ti*]. It should be said that Bühler previously said that the anusvāra of K. [*hā*]pa[*y*]iṣamti should probably be deleted; and so very nearly hit the mark.

The Mansehra text in the corresponding passages is of no value for the points at issue. The forms lack anusvāras in all cases; but *m* is so often graphically omitted that it would be rash to say that *anuva* [*t*]iṣati and the first *kaṣati* are merely textual errors. It may be remarked that *se* (which occurs twice) is a 'Māgadhism'.

On *se* as the subject of Kālsī *kachamti* and Dh. *kach(am)ti*, see the next study.

4. A SUPPOSED VEDIC ARCHAISM IN THE INSCRIPTIONS OF ASOKA.

In the third study we quoted Kālsī *se sukaṭam kachamti* and Dhauli *se (suka)ṭam kach(am)ti*. It should be remarked that *se* in these cases is a nominative plural and not a nominative singular. In a word we have the same extension of the stem *sa-* as we have in Vedic *sasmin*. The *se* is not a textual error, due to *se* as a nom. sing. of the next sentence [Kālsī *se dukaṭam kachati*, Dhauli *se (d')ukaṭam kach(a)ti*] as is clear from the fact that in the Mansehra version we find the 'Māgadhism' *se* both times in the corresponding passages. So it is certain that the *se* as a nom. pl. stood in the 'Māgadhan' original; for it is inconceivable that the Shāhbāzgarhi redaction should have a plural *te* if the 'Magadhan' original did not have a plural; and that this plural was *se* cannot be denied in view of Kālsī, Dhauli, Mansehra *se*. Moreover with the assumption of *se* as a nom. pl., Gīrnār *so sukaṭam kāsati* it is easier to explain. The scribe simply mistranslated the nom. pl. *se* by *so* because *se* as a nom. sing. was *so* in the Gīrnār dialect. Then of course *so sukaṭam *kāsamti* inevitably would be altered to *so sukaṭam kāsati* (see above).

The Dhauli redaction at v. 24 and v. 25 has the following expression *viyāpaṭā se* which is very embarrassing. Franke proposed to join *viyāpaṭāse*, making *-āse* the equivalent of Vedic *-āsas*. This at once removes all difficulties; and is especially commendable from the fact that in Prākṛit we have traces of the same formation. At the same time I would point out that corre-

sponding to Dhauli *viyāpaṭā se* at v. 24 we have Gīrnār *vyāpatā te*, Shāhbāzgarhi *vapaṭa [te]*, Mansehra *viyapuṭa te*, Kālsī *viyāpaṭā te*; and to Dhauli *viyāpaṭā se* at v. 25 we have Gīrnār *vyāpatā te*, Shāhbāzgarhi *viyapaṭra*,¹ Mansehra *viyapraṭa te*, Kālsī *viyāpaṭā te*. Since *se* as a nom. pl. is found in the Dhauli redaction, it seems to me far better to take *se* in the two passages under discussion as the equivalent of the *te* of the other versions rather than to join *-āse* and to take this as the equivalent of Vedic *-āsas*. Of course the versions do not always agree in the wording [e. g. Gīrnār *vyāpatā te*, v. 8 = Shb. *viyapuṭ[a]*, Mans. *viyapaṭa*, K. *viyāpaṭā*, Dh. (*viyāpa*)ṭā], and it may be urged that *viyāpaṭā se* at Dh. v. 25 may be *viyāpaṭāse* as in this case the Shb. redaction has no correspondent to the *te* of G., Mans. and K. Yet the fact that at Dh. v. 26 we have *ime* in *viyāpaṭā ime* corresponding to *te* in G. [**vyāpatā*t*]e, Shb. *viyapaṭa te*, Mans. *vapuṭa [te]*, Kālsī *viyāpaṭā te* is decidedly against this. For here we have an unquestioned and unquestionable nom. pl. *ime* corresponding to *te* of the other versions. It is true that in the seventh Pillar-Edict the Delhi Sivalik text has *viyāpaṭā se* three times; and here again Franke would join *viyāpaṭāse*.² The passages are DS. vii³. 4 (twice) and 6. The first time where we have *viyāpaṭā se* there is no question but that as a separate word *se* is wholly out of place, and here we might be tempted to read *-āse* as a nom. pl.; but in the second passage there is no necessity for not taking *se* as a separate word (nom. pl.); in the third *se* as a separate word is unsuitable; *-āse* would answer nicely. But the trouble is that we have no other redactions to check the Delhi Sivalik text as we have in respect to the Dhauli version of the Fourteen Edicts³; and it should be observed that although the dialects of both the Delhi Sivalik redaction of the Pillar-Edicts and the Dhauli recension of the Fourteen-Edicts are 'Māgadhan', yet they are not absolutely identical; it might be that Vedic *-āsas* survived in DS. *-āse* but was lost in Dh.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

¹ On Shb. *viyapaṭra*, etc., see Michelson, AJP. 30, pp. 426, 427.

² I formerly (IF. 23, p. 248) accepted this.

³ Bühler was well aware that in the first and last passage *se* was bothersome; and called it 'redundant'. I cannot make out if he thought it a mere error.

VII.—IDENTIFICATION OF THE ANCIENT PERSIAN MONTH GARMAPADA IN THE LIGHT OF THE RECENTLY FOUND ARAMAIC PAPYRUS FRAGMENTS.

Various views have been expressed respecting the season of the Ancient Persian month *Garmapada*, e. g., March-April (Oppert), July-Aug. (Justi). The recently discovered Aramaic Papyrus fragments of the Behistan Inscription (*Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka*, Sachau, 1911) give in No. 62 a mutilated account of the two battles with the pretender Vahyazdâta, the latter of which occurred near Mt. Parga on the 5th of the month in question. The Aramaic which everywhere translates the Babylonian version reads here, Col. I, l. 17 :

קטל חילא זוי - - - - ת בירה ת - - -

“smote the army of [Vayazdâ]t. In the month T”. (Pers. *avam kâram tyam Vahyazdâtahya ajan vasiy Garmapadahya mâhyâ V raucabiš θakatâ āhan*, III, ll. 46-7. For the final ת and the following lacuna Sachau proposes *Tiṣri* (*der Monat kann Tiṣri gewesen sein*, n. p. 195).

Now the only two Bab. months which in Aramaic would begin with ת are *Tammuz* (Aram. תמוז) and *Tiṣri* (Aram. תשרי). Sachau's supplement *Tiṣri* (Sept.-Oct.) places the Persian month too late in the calendar to account for its etymology, **garma*, “warm”, Skt. *gharma*, Av. *garəma* (New Pers. *garm*) + *pada*, “step”, “station”, Skt. *pada*, YAv. *paða* (New Pers. *pai*). This undoubtedly signifies the season of the greatest heat.

There remains, then, *Tammuz* (June-July) as the only month with which *Garmapada* can be identified. About such identification I feel there is no longer any doubt. Not only does the season of the year justify its etymology, but it brings this second battle in the second month following the first battle fought at Rakhâ on the 12th day of *Thûravâhara* (Bab. *Iyyar*, April-May). That the Aramaic fragment contains here the parallel account of these two engagements with the second Pseudo-Smerdis, the

annihilation of his forces and the execution of the usurper is clearly seen from such expressions as, Col. I, l. 12:

ת - - - - י א[מר] אנה בר[וי]

"[Vayazdâ]t who said: I am Barzî" (Pers. *Vahyazdâta hya Bardiya agaubatâ*, III. l. 35); Col. I, l. 16:

לשר[ק]ה נוי א[רתורנז]י למענבר

"against Artavarzî to make [battle], (Pers. *patiš Artavardiyam hamaranam cartanaiy*, III, l. 36); Col. II, l. 2:

ויזרת אחרו

"they seized Vayazdât", (Pers. *avam Vahyazdâtam agarbâyan*, III, l. 48).

H. C. TOLMAN.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, October 17, 1911.

VIII.—A NOTE ON THE ETYMOLOGY OF INVOLARE.

M. A. Thomas in a critique¹ of Mohl, *Les origines romanes*, under the caption *embler*, supports the old etymology, Latin *involare*, and continues as follows: "M. Mohl oublie que *involare* > *embler* se rattache non à *volare* > *voler*, mais à *vola* paume de la main".

M. Thomas would seem to hold still to the etymology of *involare* advanced by Donatus in his commentary on the Aeneid, VI, 99; 336: *Vola dicitur media pars manus, . . . unde et Involare dicimus, quum aliquid furtim vola manus subtrahitur; et Involare rursum, cum violentae manus in aliquem diriguntur, sicuti Terentius ait: Ille facile in oculos Involem venefico.* And again Papias: *Involare, in volam, i. in manum includere, furari.*² Servius, too, on the Aeneid, III, 233 and Georgics II, 88,³ offers the same etymology *in vola includere*.

The etymology *in vola includere* presents this difficulty, that the meaning is not sufficiently vigorous or emphatic to fit with most of the examples for *involare* in the sense of to steal, in which the force of the verb is obviously to make off with. Only one citation which has come to my notice (one from Petronius following) might conceivably fit with the Donatus and Servius interpretation, and that too, may be rendered with the more figurative sense.

The citations for *involare* would seem to show that its origin is plainly *in* and *volare* to fly. Even in its derived meanings to take, to steal, and the like, there seems to be present also some reminiscence of its most likely origin *volare*, to fly down upon, to swoop at. In several instances, the resulting figure is a fine and bold one. The accompanying examples are arranged with a view to showing the transitions in meaning and show equally well, it seems to me, that the verb is nowise connected with *in* and *vola*, in the sense contemplated by Donatus and Servius.

¹ Romania XXIX, 434.

² Ducange, Gloss. Med. et Infim. Latin. III, 893.

³ Facciolati, Lexicon, I, 1025.

Vix me contineam quin involem in capellum. Ter. Em., 859; His editis involat eam vestemque plurifariam diloricat.¹ Apul. Met., 6, 10. And a fine figure from Tacitus, Adeoque improvisi castra involavere, Hist., IV, 33.

Nostra est ipsa possessio in quam homines involaverunt. Cic., de Orat., III, 31, 122. Ancorae involantur de mari. Callistr., Dig., 147, 9, 6. Tum ille paulum ultra digitos in esca iaculatus hamum singulos involat verius quam capit. Plin. Hist. Nat., (ed. Janus, Leip., 1870) 9, 181.

Animos involat cupido eundi. Tac., Ann., I, 49. Remitte pallium mihi meum, quod involasti. Catul. XXV, 6. Ed. Ellis. Hereditatem accepit ex qua plus involavit, quam illi relictum est. Petr., Sat., 43. 5. Nisi si me iudicas anulos buxeos curare quos amicae tuae involasti. Petron., 58, 10 (B).

ARTHUR B. MYRICK.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

¹ The quotations from Apuleius, Pliny and Petronius, I owe to the kindness of my colleague, Professor M. B. Ogle.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie Vergils: Erklärung des Catalepton von THEODOR BIRT; Teubner, 1910. 198 pp.

The confidence of the editor in the authenticity of these poems, declared in his enlightening title, will be gratifying to those who have less regard for hereditary unbelief than for the authority of manuscripts and the voice of literary tradition, and if any have been prevented by the scepticism long prevailing in this quarter from examining the evidence bearing upon the question, they cannot do better than begin with Birt. If any should desire to read the poems without going into disputed points, this will still be the best book for a beginning. For, if the editor had accomplished nothing more, he would still deserve the credit of having restored the true reading in the first word of the first poem, the insipidity of which, as it stands in Ribbeck's text, and even in Vollmer's, which is later than Birt's, we venture to say has done as much as anything else to deter people of good intentions from going earnestly into the rest of the collection. Yet this insipidity lay in the reading of the first word.

While it is not our opinion that this will become a 'textus receptus' nor that the last word has been said about the time and place of composition of the various poems, yet we find the readings greatly improved, especially by the elimination of some of Scaliger's most mischievous conjectures, and the most interesting kind of inquiry is inaugurated touching the poet's earlier literary career. The inclusion of the Priapeia in this edition is amply justified since they, like most of the short pieces, belong to the period preceding the Eclogues, but we are not convinced that they were an original part of the roll that bore the title of Catalepton. To these commendations and criticisms we would add yet another that, while we should praise where he praises and condemn where he condemns, yet we should temper a little both favorable and adverse judgments. Estimated as a whole, the book may well be regarded as a good beginning in a field where wrong-headed cleverness and passive scepticism may be seen to have occasioned no little loss and perhaps some disgrace to culture and scholarship.

Various circumstances have worked together to hinder a candid estimate of the possible relationship of these poems to known facts of history and the poet's life and of their place in the development of Vergil's thought and art. For one thing, they were neither fit nor worthy to be used as school books and consequently we lack that information concerning them that might

have been gleaned by grammarians in times nearer to the poet's age. Yet we have the authority of Quintilian for No. ii and of Marius Victorinus for No. xii. What has been of more consequence, men have been foolishly unwilling to admit that such paltry things could have come from the same pen as the Aeneid. In like manner the friendly commentators on Horace have shrunk from saying that it is our Vergilius who is disciplined for his pursuit of gain in the twelfth ode of the fourth book and the fiction is offered, which has the virtue of being logical, that some penurious apothecary is being coerced into sacrificing a box of nard, and this in the face of the fact that Vergil is known to have died disgracefully rich. Surely it is neither improbable nor shocking to suggest that the son of a money making father varied the labor of the pen by dabbling a little in safe loans at Roman rates of interest, or in real estate, which frequently offered attractive profits. It will not destroy our respect for him if we discover that his judgment in matters of business grew with his taste in matters of meter and phrase, but if we deny him this weakness, let us at least allow him the frailty of having written some poor poetry. It may be that if we can bring ourselves to acknowledge that he was young before he was old; if we can but rid ourselves of the lingering taint of a mischievous theory of poetical inspiration, and overcome a certain dread of Homer's unimpeachable fame, who shrewdly destroyed his own juvenilia, it may be that we can strike from the poems of the Catalepton some welcome lights upon the early flounderings of the poet's mind, upon the zigzags of his intellectual interests, and the *πάρεργα* of his happier and more mature years.

This edition, besides an independent recension of the text, contains also the Priapeia and two epigrams, one of which is found only in inferior MSS, and the other believed to have been written by Varius and added to the original roll. There are the usual indices and critical apparatus. The introductory portion treats of manuscripts, original circumstances of publication, time and place of composition, and the biographical significance of the collection. The editor thinks the poems were assembled and edited by Tucca or Varius, more probably the latter, and reached the book trade shortly after the death of the author; and that the title is by Varius, chosen, however, with conscious regard for Vergil's preference for Greek words in titles. As evidence that the latter had favored the suppression of the poems, he cites the self-condemnation of Cat. v and the clause of the will which runs *ne quid ederent quod non a se editum esset*. He draws from the *suil* of the editor's epigram (xv) the inference that the poet was dead when publication actually occurred. In the biographical portion he lays stress upon the tradition that the poet's father was a *figulus* and makes an excursus upon the subject of *figlinae*. On the evidence of Cat. xiii he believes the poet to have served as a soldier, perhaps in Caesar's army.

Touching first the question of publication, it is quite in harmony with the available evidence to assume that Varius and Tucca found the poems in Vergil's library already assembled, arranged and labelled *Kατὰ Δεσφάν*. The poet had secretarial help and it seems especially likely, in view of his precarious condition of health and the contemplated journey to Greece, that he had left all his papers, as well as his affairs, duly prepared for a possible emergency. The plan of arrangement, which is perfectly manifest, certainly suggests the hand of an author rather than an editor. Since the first poem is addressed to Tucca it cannot but seem to be a sort of dedication, surely a daring arrangement for an editor. Varius is remembered in No. vii. The last has reference to the completion of the Aeneid and was doubtless composed in contemplation of the tour in the East, which we are informed by Donatus was undertaken with the purpose of putting the last hand to the Aeneid. It is therefore the latest in order of composition and properly closes the roll. The rest are disposed between with some regard for variety of meter, but a chiasmic chronological order is also apparent. Thus the epitaphic epigram for Octavius Musa (xi) is obviously later than the fourth, but of the two Nocturnus pieces, vi and xii, the latter is seen to be the earlier. The third poem, again, if Nettleship is correct in referring it to Phraates, is next to the last in order of time while the thirteenth seems to be the oldest of all. It may be remarked in passing that this manifest arrangement argues strongly against the inclusion of the Priapeia in the Catalepton. Birt's reason for regarding them as part of the Catalepton is found in these words of Donatus: *deinde Catalecton et Priapeia et Epigrammata*, which he takes to designate the contents of a roll. But the next words are *et Diras, item Cirim*, which would compel us to include the Dirae, and so the argument falls. Besides this, the Priapeia were a novelty at this time and in a class by themselves, being separately designated in all the lists.

Robinson Ellis, who has reviewed this book in part in a public lecture last year (Professor Birt's Edition of the Vergilian Catalepton: London, Frowde, 1910), praises the editor for his conservative treatment of the text along palaeographical lines, only with the modification that he leans rather heavily upon the best MS, the Bruxellensis. We regard this judgment as entirely correct. In the first poem the restoration of the reading *De qua* for Scaliger's *Delia* transforms a seemingly dull and charmless thing into something of no little grace and cleverness and the Latinity is also improved. Yet we should apply the second part of Ellis's criticism and ask for the retention of *quae* for *cui* in the last line. The purport plainly is: There is no use telling me that the woman has returned. Tell *her* that I am prevented by her husband from seeing her. The interpretation demands this, but the neatest palaeographical note in the whole book is Birt's defence of *cui* for the *qui* of B.

The Varius epigram, No. vii, which is to be associated with the first, had likewise been spoiled by Scaliger. The restoration of the Greek word, *πρότος*, in the second line results in an illuminating flash of light upon the position of Varius as praeceptor Latinitatis in the Augustan circle and upon his attitude towards Greek loan words in poetry. The suggestion of a possible connection between the *πρότος* and Vergil's slave, Eros, is likewise a happy thought.

The interpretation of the pseudo-Alexander elegy, No. iii, is long and too laboriously ingenious to be convincing. We believe Nettleship to have proved almost conclusively that the real reference is to Phraates IV, king of Parthia. Unfortunately this view was set forth in the essay attached to his *Ancient Lives of Vergil*, which has given it only a moderate degree of publicity. See pp. 35-37.

Excellent are the notes to Nos. iv and xi, elegiacs addressed to Vergil's compatriot Octavius Musa. Birt heals the text in line 6 of the former with least violence to the MSS and most regard for style and sense, but we feel that his *tam Graece* in line 10 is quite gratuitous. The traditional *nam certe* is weak, but it has a meaning and the low merit of the whole piece warns us against a too zealous improvement. The reference to the parting of the friends is taken to point with some probability to the time when Vergil finally gave up rhetoric, *circa* 43, and this assumption is strengthened by the marked Catullan character of the language. Yet in other respects it most resembles No. ix, which Birt rejects. Compare the low poetic quality of the two, the similar prominence given to Apollo and the Muses, and the use of erotesis and anaphora. Cf. also iv 6 *multa neque indigno multa dedere bona* and ix 39 *multa neque inmeritis donavit praemia alumnis*.

No. xi, which must be dated after the year 35 since Octavius was still living at that time (Hor. Sat. I 10, 82), has no little merit although extremely commonplace in its sentiment. Half of it depends, as Birt clearly shows, upon an epigram of Callimachus (Anth. Pal. 7, 725), but the reasons for transporting *Centaurium* thence into the second line of our text cut both ways and the MSS favor *a nimio pocula dura mero*, a combination of an adjective flanked by another adjective and a noun that Vergil much affects (Aen. V 696, VI 237, 290, and 576 and *passim*). We might point out the similarity of the opening words to the address to Palinurus Aen. VI 341. The whole epigram is illuminated by the true Vergilian phrase *Sua quemque secuntur fata*.

The two Nocturnus epigrams, vi and xii, are Vergil's masterpieces in the satirical manner of Catullus and exhibit Birt at his best in interpretation. We have but two or three suggestions to add. No. xii, which is the earlier, has long been marred by a mischievous emendation of Scaliger. In the last line but one he proposed *herniam*, some sort of venereal trouble, for the rare word *hirneam*, a drinking vessel. Having recovered this read-

ing from the MSS, we need only recognize in the poem a surprise like that in Catullus xiii 8, *Plenus sacculus est aranearum*, and we reach a perfect understanding. *Ducit, ut decet, superbus Noctuinus hirneam*, with a pun in *ducit*. For the image cf. Omar Khayyám lv: 'And took the daughter of the vine to spouse'. That both Noctuinus and his father-in-law are drunkards appears from No. vi, in which we believe that both Birt and Vollmer, judging from the punctuation of the latter, misunderstand the first sentence. The *beate* is a vocative and must be followed by a comma while the negatives go with the verb. It is ironical and means 'blessed with such a son-in-law', and not 'blessed with riches', as Birt would have it, an explanation not afforded by the context. Vollmer seems to take *beate* as an adverb and puts a comma after *socer*, but the metrical break is better after the second word. The translation will be: Blessed father-in-law and son-in-law Noctuinus, mass of corruption, neither for your sake nor for the other's sake will the girl, though not fastidious, disgusted by your stupidity as well as yours, go to the country with you, i. e., she prefers to stay in Rome through the hot season rather than go to the country with such sots. No editors seem to have thought of taking the negative with the predicate. Ellis changed *abibit* to *abivit*, a needless alteration if the sentence is correctly construed.

The text of the graceful little elegy, No. viii, addressed to the villa of Siro, is fortunately sound, but questions remain concerning the circumstances implied in it. We cannot see how Birt is justified in drawing from it the conclusion that Vergil spent the years 41-40 in the society of Siro. The date of composition, plainly enough, is a moment when the Mantuan disaster was apprehended but not yet a fact. What else can be the meaning of the line: *Si quid de patria tristius audiero?* This fixes the date in 41. But it always seems to us that the first two lines are a lament for Siro who seems to have passed away just at this time and perhaps has left his humble home to a beloved pupil. The intercourse with Siro we would place in the years 43, 42, and 41, two years in all, or a little more, intervening between the renunciation of rhetoric in 43 and the death of Siro in 41. Cf. Probus (Thilo III 323): *vixit pluribus annis liberali in otio secutus Epicuri sectam*. It is also interesting to note that his father is still alive and apparently with him. We hold that the whole Vergil family left Mantua when the poet came to Rome and lived off their rents, but this cannot be discussed here. Certain it is from that the last line that the family had lived in Cremona.

That *tour de force*, the parody on *Phaselus ille* of Catullus, known as x, has some interest as a curiosity and some for the satirical turn given to an innocent original, but chiefly as a youthful extravagance displaying a pleasure in parody which reappeared in the works of his mature age as an exquisite skill in creating verbal and metrical reminiscences. Upon the inter-

pretation of the text a vast quantity of ink has been used up, although the poem, if we read *utrimque* with Heyne in line 19, is quite readable as handed down. Suspicion seems to have arisen because the parody numbers only 25 and the original 27 lines. One Nansius started the trouble by interpolating a line between 17 and 18 and every editor since has taken his turn. Birt also inserts a line after 19, which has the merit of being vivid and vigorous :

Pecus recalcitrare ferreo pede ;

We translate the text from 14 to 19 without any interpolation : 'From the very first he says he has been stalled in your mud, has cast off his baggage in your quagmire, and from there through ever so many miles of rutty roads has brought his team through to their destination, no matter whether the off mule or the nigh mule or both had begun to flag'. The point is that Sabinus always arrived and never hesitated to make a *jactura* of his packs or to run the risk of killing his team. *Jugum*, by the way, is not the yoke but the team and *tulisse* is to be taken as *pertulisse*. One must not take a parody, above all things, too literally but make liberal allowances for approximations.

There are some features of Birt's work exhibited in his notes to No. xiv that will find little acceptance. To place it between the first and fifth books of the Aeneid in time of composition on the evidence of such slender phrases as *Troius Aeneas* and *mille coloribus* is most futile and to assume from the fifth and sixth lines of this poem that Vergil had previously vowed to the goddess some incense and a painted picture is too distressingly literal. In substituting *vel* for *aut* in the ninth line he has done as well as any preceding editor, but we believe that the reading of the MSS can be interpreted. It is perfectly well known that there were two types of Eros, one as an adolescent lad, which would naturally be done in marble without wings ; the other, a conventionalized child with quiver, bow, and wings. If we think of the latter as done in bronze, it might well have been the more expensive ; marbles were, by our standards, amazingly inexpensive. Now Vergil is undecided which of these two he would prefer, but he vows either the one or the other.

We quite agree with the editor in believing this is the latest in point of time, but we would have it subsequent to the years 26 or 25. The prayer to Venus is appropriate at any time in connection with the Aeneid, but it also suggests a sea voyage and especially in the parts around Pompeii. Vergil seems to vow, not the ordinary offerings of the returned traveller, but something extraordinary. He is not setting out upon an ordinary tour of sight-seeing but to meet Caesar and to put the last hand to the Aeneid. We read in the Vita of Suetonius (Nettleship, p. 17) : *Anno aetatis quinquagesimo secundo impositurus Aeneidi summam manum statuit in Graeciam et in Asiam secedere, triennioque continuo nihil amplius quam emendare, ut reliqua vita*

tantum philosophiae vacaret. The date will then be 19 B. C. Moreover we suggest that, if Birt's epigram No. xvi refers to Vergil, the key to its explanation lies in this proposed devotion to philosophy after the completion of the *Aeneid*. The epigrammatist, believing that Vergil would have proved equally great in philosophy had he lived, wrote the line:

Et quo Roma viro doctis certaret Athenis.

So far as concerns the *Priapeia*, the first is a slight thing of no difficulty but the second will bear study along a line not discovered as yet by the editors. It shows Vergil for the first time falling into a vein agreeable to his talents and, as young poets are apt to do, sowing with the whole sack. There is a good-humored piety in the thing, a pathetic interest in the lot of animals, a naïve pleasure in the mere naming of fruits and flowers, and, above all, an elaborated and schematic arrangement of words. The trick of relating the first and last words in a line as noun and adjective, used with moderation in the *Aeneid* (e. g. *Aen.* vi 137 and 141) is here exemplified no less than six times in 21 lines, and the charm of the thing has tempted him into a rare resolution in the first foot of line 14. Note lines 4, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 18. The four lines 6-9 are so symmetrical that one is reminded of the famous *sic vos non vobis* repeated four times. Each line begins with the same word; in each is a designation of color, of offering and of season. If this had fallen under Birt's notice he would never have replaced *glauca* in the last line by *gelata*, since the suggestion of color is indispensable for the scheme. His objection that olives in winter are black and not grayish green is a mere failure to remember that an olive branch with leaves and berries is offered to the god and not the picked fruit. In like manner, grain was offered in the ear and not shelled, and the vine branch with leaves and clusters. Muretus set the line right long ago:

Mihique glauca duro oliva frigore.

Some literal-minded person added *coacta* as a gloss and this begot *cocla* and the rest of the trouble. It is Vollmer that notes the reading *coacta* in R. It might be suggested also that *Manumque sursum habebis* is a warning to look out for a blow. The god threatens to strike. Birt takes it: Hände hoch! Wer die Hände so hält, kann nichts stehlen, und man kann sehen, was er darin trägt. But the prowler is addressed, not on coming out, but before ever he enters the garden.

The third *Priapeum* is of greater merit than the other two, but we should be inclined to temper the editor's praise. His annotation, however, is excellent and his text good save for one line. He explains, in a too clever note, the words *Pro quis omni honoribus* as *Pro quibus omnibus honoribus* on the model of *omnimodis* and many other interesting examples adduced. Yet

the MSS give *omnia* and this is easy to construe with *praestare* situated just below it in the next line, a common position for subject and object in poetry (see lines 1, 2, and 4 above). The difficulty which remains is most easily mended by Ribbeck's *huic* for *hoc*, which we look upon as having been assimilated to *Priapo* by mere visual attraction. This particular Priapus calls attention to himself as contrasted with the rich and negligent Priapus mentioned below. Birt's interpretation, hard in itself, necessitates our taking *que* for *et*, which is also hard. When an interpretation begets difficulties, it is a sure sign of error.

We are unable to agree with the editor in calling these poems impure (*impudica*, p. 46). They are pervaded by a sweet and innocent spirit quite foreign to the ordinary carmen Priapeum and may well have been composed at a later date than Cat. v in which the obscene muses are rebuked and renounced. As may be seen from Birt's commentary, the Catullan influence is on the wane and we believe that the poet has at last begun to discover his own talents and tastes. He knows by this time that the town and the forum are not for him. He has begun to contemplate what he really loved and to give way to those sentiments aroused by the memory of boyhood scenes, that presently burst into gentle flame when his poetic genius was fructified by the calamity of Mantua. The happy feeling and almost jocular good-humor of these Priapeia would incline us to place them in the period following the renunciation of rhetoric and preceding the confiscations. Birt finds in them a *Lokallton* and would have them written much earlier and at Mantua. Yet when we remember that Farm Ballads are written in New York, Sicilian Idylls in Egypt, and that Arcadia is Arcadian only at a distance from Arcadia, we are not likely to forget that sentiment feeds chiefly on separation. There are Mantuan touches in this third Priapeium in the 'thatched cot' and the 'swampy villa', but, after all, Priapus is the god of the suburban garden and not the open country, and the *villula*, the *agellulum*, and the *hortulus* bespeak that central part of Italy and the regions where holdings were small, fruit precious, and thieves numerous. In the south of Italy they fed pears to the hogs (Hor. Ep. 17, 15-19) and we suspect that in the Transpadane country such fruit as the country afforded was equally free. Therefore we should say that the scenery of this Priapeium is Neapolitan with Mantuan coloring just as that of the Eclogues, already taking shape subconsciously by this time, is Sicilian with a similar admixture. The language of the Eclogues begins to appear in such phrases as *Huius nam domini . . . pauperis tuguri* (cf. Ecl. I 68); and in the second Priapeium

Meisque pinguis agnus ex ovilibus
Gravem domum remittit aere dexteram.

Cf. Ecl. I 33-35.

So far as regards the general question of time and place of composition, we find the considerations he advances to be most

enlightening even when not decisive. The chronology depends chiefly upon Nos. ii and v, the former being of necessity earlier than Cicero's jest on the name of Cimber (Phil. XI 14); the latter, of similar tone, containing his farewell to rhetoric and the unchaste muses. The influence of Catullus is most marked in work done before this time, which must include the impure No. xiii, the two Nocturnus epigrams Nos. vi and xii, and the parody on *Phaselus ille*, No. x. The pseudo-Alexander epigram, which Birt takes to be a youthful exercise on a scholastic theme, seems to us too sincere for such and to exhibit a true Vergilian feeling. Nettleship has the best arguments for referring it to Phraates IV and this would place it late in the thirties. The address to Siro's villa (viii) belongs to 41 at a time when the Mantuan confiscation was feared but not yet executed. The poems to Tucca and Varius (i and vii) are uncertain, but we should be inclined to place them in the early years of the Augustan court, *circa* 39. Birt says between 40 and 30. The last epigram he assigns to the year 25, when Augustus was calling for the Aeneid, but we have thought it to belong to the year of his Vergil's departure for Greece, perhaps 20 or 19. The Priapeia we have given reasons for placing just before the Eclogues that pertain to Mantua, that is, between 43 and 41. Birt thinks they were written before 43 and certainly not later than 30. No. ix, the elegy of 64 lines addressed to the Messallae, we shall presently discuss by itself.

Place of composition: Birt is certainly mistaken in thinking No. vi may have been written in Cremona; the *rus abibit* surely places it in Rome; all Italy was *rus* to the ancient Roman. No. xii cannot be separated from vi. It is, of course, interesting and important to know that the name Atilius is evidenced by the inscriptions of that country and that a temple of Castor and Pollux (see No. x) is known in Cremona, yet satire belonged to the capital and this particular series may have been written for the amusement of the Transpadane colony in Rome, which we know was numerous and prominent in the last years of the republic. The Priapeia we ascribe to the Neapolitan region while Birt thinks them composed during vacations spent in Mantua.

We are not prepared at the present time to discuss every question that may be raised in connection with the Messalla elegy, but we call attention to the following evidences seeming to point to a time about 37 B. C., in which we widely differ from the editor, who would have it later than the triple triumph of the year 29: Vergil has already renounced oratory: *Pingui nil mihi cum populo* (line 64), words that no orator might use; secondly, he has already written Eclogues: lines 13-20; lastly, he still thinks of himself as epigrammatist: *Si laudem aspirare, humilis si adire Cyrenas*, etc. (line 61 ff.). It is furthermore perfectly clear from the last ten lines of the elegy that Vergil has been

invited or importuned to write an epic upon Messalla's exploits, or perhaps those of the Valerian gens, a request that never would have been proffered if he had already become engaged upon the Georgics or the Aeneid. The occasion is therefore of such a kind that the poet is already a marked man but at the moment without a commission.

About its authenticity, we do not believe that mere metrical and stylistic peculiarities will be sufficient to condemn it for the generality of scholars, and Birt himself admits the lack of positive anachronisms and historical inconsistencies. In every collection there must be a worst poem, and the excessive anaphora and erotesis, together with its general 'creeping' style, an apt adjective from Ellis's review, condemn this poem to such a place in the Catalepton, but the average is not high and this must stand or fall with the rest. Perhaps it marks a lull in the poet's career. The vein of feeling that produced the Eclogues was but a "pocket" at best, and a direction for new labors was not at once discovered. It points, like all of the epigrams, to a field that the poet was tempted to exploit but found it wise to abandon. Yet we regard the theory of Birt that their publication was due to his literary executors as all important for their proper understanding. Vergil seems to have wished nothing of his work to remain that he considered as falling below a certain self-imposed standard, a tradition that has nourished scepticism in regard to the minor poems, but we may feel sure that he wrote much of an inferior quality and we ought to seize the opportunity of studying, as we would the juvenilia of a modern author, what we have such good reasons for regarding as the fruits of his apprenticeship.

Considering its length, it offers few textual difficulties, but there is a crux in the lines 29-30. For the solution of this we suggest *biingum* for *multum* and, taking *obstabant* with Vollmer for the usual *optabant*, thus obtain a reading nearer to the MSS than any yet proposed. The contestants failed one after another because their 'heavy hands' were slow to be raised in prayer. Pelops succeeded because he went apart and prayed (Pindar, Ol. I 114). So in the Aeneid, Cloanthus (V 231 ff.), Eurytion (ibid. 514), and many others pray and win victory. We dislike Birt's *sitiens* in 32 as an incongruous idea in a line whose appeal is strongly visual, and for the same reason cling to the *similis* of the MSS. But we like his *expectans* in 34 against Scaliger's *expertae*, which the MSS do not support. We would demand reconsideration for the *solitos* of the minor MSS in 43. It will be anacoluthic, referring to *alumnis* above, and involves a rough transition to the singular in the next line, but there is an awkward transition in any case, though no worse than the difficulty of defining the connection of ll. 59 and 60 below. Birt's *ros/ris* is inconsistent with the contempt for popular arts expressed in the last line and the pile of dissyllabic datives is displeasing both in sound and sense.

The most serious flaw in Birt's plea for rejection is the failure to show reasons why Varius inserted it in the original roll. It is equally difficult to conceive of wilful interpolation or of ignorance on his part of its true authorship.

N. W. DE WITT.

Lo Stato e l'Istruzione Pubblica nell' Impero Romano. By CORRADO BARBAGALLO. Biblioteca di Filologia Classica, no. 3. Fr. Battiato, Catania, 1911. Pp. 430.

L'istruzione pubblica in Europa è tutta creazione italica. With this sentence, which purports to give the gist of what Boissier (*La fin du paganisme*, I, 228 ff.) says about Roman culture and education following the Roman armies, Professor Barbagallo begins his book, which deals with the relations of the State to public instruction in the Roman empire. The author has already printed in the *Rivista di filologia classica* for 1910 an article on the School and State in republican Rome, and the volume under consideration is a continuation of his studies. The period of the empire offers more material and is much more to the author's taste than that of the republic: "For the Roman empire, the ideal state is the one which cares for public instruction at its own expense; for the republic, every *paese civile* might serenely pay no attention to such preoccupations".

The upshot of the whole matter, despite the author's commendations and criticisms of this and that emperor, is, that public instruction in the Roman empire was very much a luxury and scarcely at all a necessity. A desire to imitate Greece and Alexandria, sentiment, an imperial purpose to attach the youth to the policies of the throne, and even charitable enterprises, which had an ulterior design, all these forces are discernible back of the educational movements during the period of the empire. The Roman state displayed its activities in the matter of education along three lines: the creation of public and official schools; the regulation of municipal public instruction; and a general oversight of private instruction. It outlined as its fundamental curriculum of instruction these studies, mentioned in chronological sequence, Greek and Latin oratory, philosophy, jurisprudence, Latin language and literature.

Of the Julio-Claudian emperors, Augustus and Nero attained to the height of good and bad eminence. Claudius halted along the philological path and set a few standards, but he had not the ability to initiate an educational policy, perhaps for lack of a Horace or a Seneca. Augustus inaugurated both novelties and reforms. He made concessions of consequence to the teachers, *magistri*, he instituted a school for the instruction of the young nobility, the school which Verrius Flaccus taught, and he began the building of public libraries. In his tracks followed the

aristocracy, *pedissequa imitatrice*, and libraries, museums, and galleries sprang up in Rome and set the pattern for municipia and provinces. An additional personal interest attaches to the two greatest of Augustus' reforms. He was cured of a severe illness in 23 B. C. and shortly afterwards had the Senate grant freedom from taxes of all kinds to the members of the medical profession who came from the Orient. Very soon physicians and surgeons were giving lectures and making experiments of all sorts in Rome, and in this way began what approached regular medical schools. But what showed most clearly the spirit of his reforms, was the organization of the Italian youth into associations called *collegia iuvenum*, which were schools started with a purpose indeed, for in them the political and social ideas of Augustus were inculcated, and through them disseminated over the Roman world. But it was not until the time of Nero that the Roman government paid any real attention to public instruction. At that time one thing more was added to the school curriculum, namely physical education, and the schools were put under strict imperial supervision. Professor Barbagallo says that the enigma of the strange kinds of intellectual production in the following centuries is to be read in the change from Augustus to Nero, that the schools in this interim lost their spirit of liberty of both intellect and conscience, that the schools of rhetoric after Nero no longer produced orators, but rhetoricians, that the schools of philosophy crystallized into dry hermeneutics and sophistry, and that physical education degenerated into athletics and acrobatics. Culture and science became a sort of intellectual ornament. However the author makes it clear that the Julio-Claudian emperors gave a great impulse to general education by granting concessions and privileges to certain studies and teachers, by founding libraries, by introducing the Greek type of physical education, which included music, and by setting a higher standard for the official education of young men.

The Flavii were adaptationists, and even hardheaded Vespasian dared but one innovation, and that an economic one. He fixed the stipend for teachers of rhetoric, and set a maximum honorarium of about one dollar a month per student. Titus and Domitian were practically negligible quantities, although the latter did rebuild some libraries, and restored physical education to its Greek standard.

The period, however, from Nerva to Marcus Aurelius shows a strong reactionary movement. Nerva and Trajan were not at all in sympathy with the policies of the Flavii, and the reaction of their reigns extends also to the public and private schools. It is no longer the fashion to let things drift in the good old way. A new library, and a splendid one, the Ulpia-Traiana, was built in Rome, a new scheme was set on foot for the benefit of needy young men, the institution of state aid for *pueri alimentarii*, and all teachers were granted not only immunities but honors. Then

came Hadrian with his Athenaeum modelled after institutions of the same sort which he had seen in Greece and Alexandria, and finally Marcus Aurelius who endowed certain university chairs in Athens. This whole period, says the author, shows educational advance, experiments in curricula, better administration, and real encouragements to teachers.

Professor Barbagallo finds very little to say of the period from Commodus to Diocletian. He notes that under the Severi the *collegia iuvenum* take on more of a military character, that the alimentary institutions of the previous century decline, that the chairs of astrology are suppressed at the same time that the Christian libraries are destroyed, and he is not able to show that public education made any real advance during the period. A part of this chapter is taken up with statistics which give the scale of prices for teachers, and based on a class of 50 it is shown that these salaries varied from about \$15 per month for the teachers of elementary grades, of gymnastics, writing, etc., to \$50 a month for teachers of literature and rhetoric.

The rest of the book, which covers the period to the sixth century A. D., is a series of statements of imperial grants of immunities to the *magistri* of various branches of learning, and of the changing laws regarding the scale of salaries and honoraria, which runs more and more into a description of the collections of law codes, and their value in the general scheme of public instruction and general education.

In conclusion, then, for the Romans, until the time of Justinian, the State school was a luxury. The State limited the control of education to an examination into the capacity, diligence, and morality of the teacher, while it left everything else, hours, curricula, and methods, to the teacher himself. "The schools of antiquity, which did not give diplomas, which did not know the *humiliating subjection of examinations*, had no need to promote by artifices the teachers' diligence and the efficiency of their teaching". It is Justinian who is blamed at the last for compelling the public schools to follow a set program which was based on the program fixed for the few schools of jurisprudence, and thus causing stagnation to fall upon public instruction, because the teacher's initiative was entirely taken away from him.

Professor Barbagallo has done a good piece of hard work with fairly scant material. He does not know Sandys' *A History of Classical Scholarship*, the first volume of which might have given him several suggestions, and helped make a fuller bibliography. The general reader will find that with the help of the very complete capitular summary on pages 409 to 415, the reading of the Conclusion of the book, pages 379 on, will give him the general lines of the author's investigations and conclusions.

RALPH VAN DEMAN MAGOFFIN.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

HERMES XLIII.

Fascicle I.

Palladius und Gargilius Martialis. M. Wellmann shows that most of the twelve or thirteen citations of Gargilius Martialis (250 A. D.) by Palladius (350 A. D.), the last of the extant Roman agriculturists, indicate a wider reach. The whole chapter on the cultivation of the almond tree is from G. M., although he is named only in II 15, 10. By comparing the fragments of Garg. Mart. in the Neapolitan palimpsest (Angelo Mai classic. avct. I 391) with Palladius, the Geoponica, Columella, etc., W. shows that Palladius is mostly an abbreviated Garg. Mart., to whom the former probably owed his frequent citations (often with criticism) of Columella, and the numerous references to alii, aliqui, etc., and to the Graeci, as well as all the chapters that include medical lore from Pliny, Galen, Dioscurides, etc. Instead of deriving, with Gemoll (1884), Palladius from Anatolius (a source of the Geoponica), Wellmann explains the correspondence between Palladius and the Geoponica as due to common sources of the latter and Garg. Mart. Eugene Oder (A. J. P. XII 373) has traced the origin of the Geoponica (950 A. D.) through Cassianus Bassus (saec. VI A. D.) to Anatolius and Didymus (saec. IV or V A. D.) and further through the Greek Florentinus (250 A. D.) (an important source of Anatolius), to the Greek writing Quinctilii (saec. II A. D.) and Diophanes (50 A. D.), the epitomizer of Dionysius-Mago, and now Wellmann shows that Garg. Mart. also depended on Diophanes, possibly through the Quinctilii. Besides much else, W. shows, incidentally, that Faventinus, the epitomizer of Vitruvius, antedates Garg. Mart., on whom also Isidore (saec. VI A. D.) depended for his work on trees, a thesis that he will elaborate later.

Zum Alphabet und zur Sprache der Inschrift von Novilara. E. Lattes discusses the correspondences between the pre-Roman inscription of Novilara (cf. A. J. P. XVIII, p. 366) and the Etruscan language; viz., the b of *bales'* and certain words (see Pauly-Wissowa Etr. Sprache 780).

Die Komödienpapyri von Ghorân. A. Körte republishes with critical and exegetical commentary these 125 lines, many of them fragmentary, with constant reference to Jouguet's publication in B. C. H. XXX (1906), which includes the conjectures of Blass, Wilcken and Croiset. He changes the assignments of parts and develops a rather spirited scene between Phaidimus

and Niceratus, a misjudged friend. The plot however is not apparent. Blass and Jouguet were inclined to attribute these fragments to the Ἀπιστος of Menander; but the style lacks his directness and conciseness and resembles rather that of a later imitator. A limited vocabulary is indicated by the three occurrences of the rare διαμαρτάνω [but cf. 29 examples in Preuss' Index Dem.], the repetition of similar phrases as τοῦτ' ἤρου με, ἤρου τοῦτό με and the frequent colorless πράγμα (avoided by Menander). The dative form αὐτοῖσι, which does not occur in the Middle and New Comedy, is probably a poetic reminiscence. To this absence of feeling for Attic usage may be due the use of σαντόν for σέ. The accumulation of twenty cases of the waning perfect indicates a striving for effect. Word forms, in general, are correct; the hybrid οἶσθας is characteristic of Attic comedy. These papyri are interesting for preserving the oldest known comic text (200 B. C.). The occurrence of χορ[οῦ and χορο[ῦ (possibly χορός), strengthens the previously known epigraphical and literary evidence (the most important of which K. discusses), that the singing chorus, like the mask, had not been wholly discarded in the III century B. C. On the verso of the second papyrus are two metrical arguments in the guise of prologues, clearly later additions, which seem to reveal an intermediate stage between prologues and the metrical arguments to the comedies of Aristophanes. [See now W. Michel, de fabularum Graecarum argumentis metricis, Gissae, 1908].

Ergänzungen und Bemerkungen zu dem Krates-Excerpt des Scholion Genevense ϕ 195. H. Schrader emends, expands and interprets this important excerpt from Crates of Mallos with the aid of Nicole's special edition of the scholia to ϕ, Steph. Byzant., etc. According to Crates Homer had ἡ ἐκτὸς θάλασσα in mind when in ϕ 195-197 he let all waters issue from Ὀκεανός, hence agreed with οἱ ἀρχαῖοι φυσικοί (possibly Anaximander) in taking the Caspian sea to be a gulf (cf. Hdt. A 203 for the correct view), and, referring to περὶ τοῦ τρίτου, i. e., v. 197 (Schrader; Diels reads τοῖς τρισίν), C. says Homer also agreed with οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα φυσικοί (i. e., Hippon and Xenophanes) in letting all springs, etc., come from the same source. Crates attributed the name Ὀκεανός to the βάρβαροι of the Caspian sea, and considered Μεγάλη θάλασσα a translation of an Asiatic term, possibly Phoenician, and Ἀτλαντικὸν πέλαγος specifically Hellenic.

Zur Composition der Sophokleischen Antigone. A. B. Drachmann essays to prove that Sophocles introduced the sprinkling of dust by Antigone (ἀφροσίωσις), for the more heroic act of burial of the old Theban tradition (cf. Apollodorus III 78; also Philostratus' Imag. II 29 and Pausanias IX 25, 2), as an afterthought. The play was virtually complete up to the Teiresias scene, when a few changes, chiefly the second guard scene and vv. 246/7, 255/6, sufficed to substitute the symbolical act, which made Antigone's deed more credible and seemly in the eyes of his

audience; besides, the body remaining unburied, made the change in Creon's sentiment easier and the Teiresias scene more thrilling. But incongruities were left, witness: Creon's suspicion of bribery (289 ff.), of help v. 488 (Ismene) and of a plurality of culprits (302, 324/5); the chorus' praise of δεινότης (332 ff.) and hope (615); Haemon's reference to rescue from dogs and birds (696/8); and, especially, the description of the mysterious (θειήλατον 278) disappearance of the body (245-258), which reaches its climax in ἡφάνιστο. The additions in 246/7 and 255/6 make this passage absurd and the terror of the guards (259 ff.) unnecessary, as they easily removed the cause of their alarm (409/10). See also vv. 43, 71 f., 80/1, 90 f., 467, 503 f., 891-904. A careful analysis is desirable.

Beiträge zum Text und Stil der Schriften Dions von Prusa. E. Wenkebach discusses fully, in twenty paragraphs, various features of D.'s style with a tendency to preserve the MS tradition: I. Kaibel's change (Hermes XXXVI, p. 608) in Dio XXXIII, 1 of οἴσθε . . . ἔπειτα . . . ποθεῖτε το αἰόμενοι κτλ. is unnecessary as D., at times, lets ἔπειτα (without δὲ and a preceding πρῶτον μὲν) connect two verbs.—II. Arnim's note to ἐκείνοις γὰρ . . . ἄγρας (Dio IV, 127) is: dele; proverbial non solent explicare scriptores; but Dio does explain them (cf. XXXII, 49; XLVII, 16).—IX. The sudden change from a general statement to the direct ἔχετε in LXXX, 10 (Arnim: malim ἔχουσι) has support in the best authors. A colloquial dropping into direct speech can be seen in IV, 16; XIII, 9; and I, 55. Not only chiasm, but the more artificial order abc, cba occur in Dio, who revelled, after the fashion of Gorgias and Isocrates, in tripartite structure in his youthful speech LXXV (cf. also II 8, LXXI, 3 f., LXVI 12); but exact correspondence should not be forced. Dio rarely differentiates synonyms, viz., I 20 φιλεῖσθαι—ἐρᾶσθαι (cf. Xen. Hiero XI, 11) and XXXVI 60 ἡσθη—ἐχάρη δὲ καὶ ἐτέρφθη (cf. Plato Prot. 337 c); but he frequently interchanges them, viz., (XXXI 43) δύναμις and ἰσχύς; IV 29 δαιμόνιος and θεία, etc.; accordingly δφιν (MSS) for ἔχιν in LXXIV 20 may be correct. The frequent coupling of synonyms in the speeches that have the impress of homilies (cf. I, IV 82 ff., VII 81 ff., XXX, XXXVI 29 ff., XXXVIII, XL, LXXII/VIII) indicates emotion and the preacher's aim to be impressive, in which he imitates Plato rather than the Cynic philosophers, as Schmid thought. The usual connective of the synonyms is καί, but often τε καί, after the example of Plato, especially in emotional harangues; on the other hand in argumentative discourse he follows the Attic orators in separating τε . . . καί.

Zu Quintilians grossen Declamationen. R. Reitzenstein in a critical commentary on the first half of the fifth oration of the collection of nineteen pseudo-Quintilian speeches shows that Lehnert's edition, which is based on the critical apparatus of H. Dessauer and excels all previous editions, is nevertheless far

from final. R. emends a number of passages and points out interpolations. He considers B the most reliable of the MSS.

Der neue Menander. F. Leo contributes forty-eight pages to the reconstruction of the four plays of Menander: *Heros* (?), *Epitrepontes*, *Perikeiromene* and *Samia* (?). (of a fifth there is but a trace), found at Aphroditopolis on the Nile in 1905, and published at Cairo by Lefebvre in 1907. Of these five plays some 1300 readable lines have been recovered, which, added to the previously discovered fragments, including those of several other plays, brings the resurrected Menander up to more than 1900 verses. Leo reconstructs interestingly with frequent reference to Plautus and Terence. The reputation of the Romans will probably grow; at the same time the force of the original language and setting is very effective and we feel that the characters stand in a stronger light and are more real. We are strongly reminded of Aristophanes by the vivacity of the scenes, the occurrence of personal abuse (cf. *Samia* 256 ff.) and by the device of beginning with a dialogue scene followed by a prologue. Leo says: Wenn auch die neue Komödie ein Adoptivkind der euripideischen Tragödie ist, ihre Mutter war doch die *ἀρχαία κωμῳδία*. The introduction of a *κῶμος* of youthful revellers at the end of two acts, evidently to dance and possibly to sing an interlude (cf. also the frequent interact sign *χοροῦ*), is clearly the last remnant of the Old Attic chorus. Many other lessons may be drawn.

Miscellen: H. v. Arnim joins the Menandrian fragments L and P [to which Ricci added S., which led to the recognition of the fifth play (cf. Koerte, *Menandria*, p. viii)].—Th. Reinach defends his conjecture *Ἰσοδῆμον τοῦ Τρωιζηνίου* against that of Keil (cf. A. J. P. XXXI, p. 481).—W. A. Heidel shows in two passages of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, how the commentary of Asclepius helps to emend the text: A 1. 981^a 12 *πρὸς μὲν οὖν τὸ πράττειν ἐμπειρία τέχνης οὐδὲν δοκεῖ διαφέρειν* should read *ἐμπειρίας τέχνη*, and in A 9. 992^b 7 *περί τε κινήσεως, εἰ μὲν ἔσται* (A^b E) *ταῦτα κινήσεις* κτλ. should read *εἰ μὲν ἔστι* (H^b and the lemma in the text of Asclepius) *κινήσεις* (omitting the unintelligible *ταῦτα*).—F. Hiller v. Gaertringen publishes with commentary a better text of CIG 2433, which he discovered by means of a marginal note in a Berlin copy of CIG, in *Opuscoli volgari e latini del conte M. Egizio Napoletano*; also a second inscription B, derived from the same stone. In the family stemma, which von G. constructs from the names in A, occurs *Κλειφῶσσι* (*Κλειφάουτja* Bechtel), with which he identifies the impossible *Κλεισφύσσα* of CIG 2439, which Pape-Benseler accepted.—Karl Robert communicates two verbally given emendations by F. Blass: *Arist. Av. v. 41 κίδων* (*δικῶν* MSS) and *Moschus, Europa 60 ὥς ἰστίον* (*ὥσει τέ τις* MSS).

Fascicle II.

Neue Beiträge zur Textgeschichte und Kritik der Philonischen

Schriften. L. Cohn describes the merits of the fifth volume of the Cohn-Wendland edition of Philo (Berlin, 1896-1906), giving a sketch of the history of the text. Mangey's edition (London, 1742) has notes that are still valuable. The excellence of F (saec. XV) was revealed by Cohn's collation of the Vatican Philo palimpsest. He discusses more than seventy passages, in which the reasons for the text adopted are less obvious, and points out features of Philo's style. The better MSS show an avoidance of hiatus. Often both classes of the MSS must be combined to obtain the original pairs of synonyms of which Philo was fond. Philo used intransitively ἐπιδυέτω, δεῖν = δέον, and the Attic future in -ίω verbs (sporadic cases of the κοινή forms with σ need correction.)

Die Litterarische Stellung des Anonymus Argentinensis. R. Laqueur objects to Wilcken's theory that the fragments of the Strassburg papyrus (See A. J. P. XXXI, p. 477) are brief extracts from a commentary on Demosthenes' κατ' Ἀνδροτίωνος. All the statements cannot directly be connected with the text, there are no verbal elucidations, lemmata do not occur, and an epitome of scholia would be an inexplicable novelty. The correspondence with the above speech, a brilliant discovery of W., can be accounted for on the supposition that we have a summary of a book περὶ Δημοσθένους, analogous to the recently discovered work of Didymus, perhaps another of his productions. The Didymus papyrus shows the haphazard character of such a capitulatio (cf. Diod. and Euseb.). In the Did. pap., brief summaries over the single columns, with which they do not exactly correspond, represent original marginal arguments, such as are found in the Diod. MS. Vindobonensis, which have made a restoration of the lost capitulatio of the first book possible. Four types appear—1, introduction with τίς; 2, with ὅτι (ὡς); 3, with περὶ c. gen.; 4, with the nom. case. Most of the statements of the Anonymus begin with ὅτι; but the other forms seem to have been included, as περὶ is suggested by the genitive l. 25; and l. 19 may be restored <τίνες οἱ> πάλαι κωλακρέται. Accordingly, the summary of the Did. pap., and we may say of the Anonymus, were based on an historical work, which explains not only the preponderating agreement with Dem. text, but also the discrepancies. Keil's view of the character of the papyrus is accordingly nearer the truth.

Miscellanea critica scripsit Fr. Jacobs. J. Nicole gives an account of this MS, dated 1812/3, which had lain in the library of J. Adert at Geneva until the latter's death in 1886, when it came into the possession of L. Wuarin, a son-in-law, who has given it to Nicole. It consists of 358 pages of carefully written emendations of some twenty-six authors, including, besides Lysias and Andocides, writers of the Alexandrian and Roman periods: Apol. Rhod., Aratus, Plutarch, Lucian, etc. To most of them are devoted from two to a dozen pages; but to Themis-

tius 29, to Lucian 59 and to Libanius 132. Subsequent additions show a tremulous hand, and frequently conjectures were changed or canceled. This interesting document is valuable for its agreements and for new conjectures. Nicole illustrates with the notes to Lysias (Books XIX-XXI and XXIV-XXXIV; the rest had already been treated in the *Additamenta in Athenaeum*): Lysias XXXIV 5, J. anticipates Thalheim in proposing ὅτι τῷ μὲν for αὐτῷ μὲν (Scheibe); XX 24, Scheibe assumes a lacuna after οὐκ ἦν. J. reads ἐξέπεμψεν ὡς τοὺς ἰππέας. ὑμῖν δ' οὐκ ἦν εἰδέναι οἷος ἦν τ. ψ.; XIX 10, καὶ ἂν τί ποθεν μὴ δῶσιν, where Scheibe hesitatingly adopts λάβωσιν, J. proposes κερδάνωσιν with the comment: Nihil frequentius permutatione litterarum μῆ et κερ (=Contius). Nicole especially recommends his insertion of ἐν δυνάμει after ἐγενόμην XXV 14 (cf. XXIV 25), where Scheibe omitted ἐπὶ before τῶν τετρακοσίων.

Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in Kleinasien in nachchristlicher Zeit. K. Holl adduces evidence from ecclesiastical documents that show the existence of the Mysian (or Bithynian-Phrygian), Isaurian, Cappadocian, Lycaonian (cf. Acts 14, 11) dialects in Asia Minor in the sixth century A. D. As late as this two Lycaonian monasteries were founded in Constantinople (for the current view see Thumb: *Die Gr. Spr. im Zeitalt. d. Hell.* p. 102 f.). The Christian church found the heathenism and heresies of A. M. strongly intrenched among the common people, whose native peculiarities and superstitions asserted themselves in their beliefs, and who, doubtless, had a source of resisting power in their native languages.

Der neue Historiker und Xenophon. G. Busolt discredits the new historical fragment (P), published in Oxyrhynchus Pap. Vol. V (1908), by bringing it into sharp contrast with the corresponding parts of Xen. *Hellenica*, beginning with the most divergent, the campaign of Agesilaus in Lydia; of which Xenophon, an eyewitness, was unusually well qualified to give an accurate account, even after the lapse of years. P.'s unmilitary version consists mostly of pure inventions, which exhibit a systematic attempt to outdo Xenophon, hence furnish further evidence of the authorship of Theopompus, whose changing much of Xen. history for the worse was criticised by Porphyrius (Euseb. *praep. ev.* X. p. 465), and whose ignorance of warfare was denounced by Polybius (XII 25 f.). The same method of manufacturing history can be seen in P.'s account of Agesilaus' expedition through Mysia and the Hellespontian Phrygia, in which B. points out verbal agreements with Xenophon's account. In the subsequent more complex discussion of the Phocian-Locrian war of 395 B. C., Busolt ably defends Xenophon's statements (*Hell.* III 5, 1 ff.) that Tithraustes sent the fifty talents to stir up war, that the Athenians refused the money offered, that the Opuntian Locrians began by invading Phocis; against P.'s version (acceptable to the editors) that Pharnabazus sent the money, that the

Athenians also accepted money, and that the Phocians made the beginning by invading the territory of the western Locrians. Busolt argues that the Greek historian (referred to by *τις*), whom P. criticizes for the statement that the Persian money brought on the war (no doubt a prejudiced Spartan view), was Xenophon; but shows that elsewhere Xenophon displayed a far deeper comprehension of the underlying causes than P., whose account reflects the Phocian war in 356/5 B. C. However Busolt admits that P. gives valuable details, though many are beyond control, and considers his description of the Boeotian constitution the most valuable part of the fragment. Accepting the identification of P. with Theopompus he gives an unfavorable characterization of this historian, whom some have rated very high. Kaibel's judgment is just (*Stil u. Text der 'Αθ. πολ. des Aristoteles*, p. 106). The agreement of P. with Diodorus is due to the latter's dependence on Ephorus, who in turn, depended on Theopompus. Busolt removes the chronological difficulties of this sequence.

Eine Dublette in Buch IV des Lucrez. J. Mewaldt objects to the transposition of verses in Book IV (45-48. 26-43. 51-53. 44. 54 ff.), and to the excision of vv. 49. 50. For vv. 45-48 are closely connected with the subsequent lines and admirably join book IV *De simulacris* to II (notice in v. 47 the neat volitent). Apparently Lucretius at first followed Epicurus, who let the doctrine of the *εἰδωλὰ* succeed the *exordia rerum* (cf. *Diog. Laert. X 35 ff.* = Usener, *Epicurea* 1887, p. 3 ff.). But after book III, *De anima*, had been composed, the conception of which had been formed during the writing of book IV (hence the allusions: IV 384 f., 465 f., 722 f., 881 f.) L. decided to insert it between II and IV. This explains the doublet 26-44, which joins IV to III. Further Lucretius now recognizing that the prooemium (IV 1-25), which prepares the reader for the difficulties of book IV, suitable as it was after book II, was out of place after the difficult book III, but wishing to preserve it, inserted the passage in book I (926-950), with the introductory lines 921-925, where it loses in dignity and interrupts the context (cf. also Merrill *Lucr. I 926 note*). Finally Lucretius let the verses IV 45-48, with which he had joined IV to II serve him to join III to II (cf. III 31-34). These changes, probably on loose leaves, give a picture of the stage of composition reached by the author.

Miscellen: M. Holleaux defends the common view, based on Livy (= Polybius) XXXIII 47, 49, 5, etc.), that Hannibal met Antiochus at Ephesus 195 B. C., against Niese's date 196 B. C., based on Appian *Syr.* 4 and Nepos *Hann.* 7, 6.—A. Körte goes further than Leo as to the *χορός* in Menander, showing that the *κῶμος* of youthful revellers participated to some extent in the action, even so as to sing with the actors; but the unimportant songs were not published. This argues against a high narrow stage in Menander's time. Even the Roman *Togata* (cf. Cic.

pro Sestio 118) indicates a similar existence of the chorus.—O. Immisch adds a corroboration of the last statement.—Leo reads καὶ γὰρ <μεθύσων> ἐπὶ κῶμον ἀνθρώπων in Athenaeus VIII 362^c and discusses βαλλισμός [ballet], showing the existence of a κῶμος of exhilarated youth in the 'Middle' comedy. He also points out survivals of this freer chorus of Alexis and Menander in Plautus.—H. Fischl shows that the source of the plot after which the Ἐπιτρέποντες was named, was Euripides' Alope (cf. Hygin. fab. 187, also Nauck trag. Græc. frag.², p. 389 f.) and remarks on the tragic allusions in Menander (cf. Ἐπιτρέπ. 108 ff.).—S. Sudhaus prefers the reading of the MSS Fl'y for Horace's Sat. I 4, 35: excutiat, sibi non, non cuiquam (cf. Arist. Nicom. Eth. 1128a 33); and takes regis opus in Ars poet. 65 to refer to Xerxes' canal at Mt. Athos (cf. Ausonius Mosella 291).—A. Klotz defends his preference (cf. Quaest. Plin. geogr. 1906, p. 8 and 49) of Pliny's chronological date 46 A. D. for the appearance of the volcanic island Thia, to the consular date 19 A. D. in the same passage (nat. hist. 2, 202), which latter is clearly an error. Hence Mela's source wrote after 46 A. D. and Rabenhorst errs in taking Verrius Flaccus to have been the common source of Mela and Pliny.

HERMAN L. EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE, BALTIMORE.

PHILOLOGUS LXIX (N. F. Bd. XXIII), 1910.

I, pp. 1-9. K. Borinski, Goethe's 'Urworte. Orphisch'. The mystery enshrouding the inspiration of Goethe's poem is dispelled by the entries in his Diaries, Sept. 27-Oct. 8, 1817. The dispute of Hermann and Creuzer on certain mythological points, their letters, and Zoëga's treatise on "ΑΓΑΘΗ ΤΥΧΗ Tyche und Nemesis" gave rise to his poem. In Zoëga's treatise Macrob. Sat. I c. 19 is cited, and a fifth 'Urwort' is added Ἐλπίς. The stanza "Heut und Ewig" publ. in 1820 must have been produced about the same time.

II, pp. 10-34. G. A. Gerhard, Zu Menanders Perikeiromene. An attempt to describe in some detail, but without too much technical reference the form and action of this charming play.

III, pp. 35-39. K. Burkhard, Zur Kapitelfolge in Nemesius' περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου. As the work has not come down to us in its complete form, we should keep to the order of the chapters offered by the MSS, although Matthäi proposes 17-19, 21, 20; K. v. Holzinger 17, 18, 21, 19, 20.

IV, pp. 40-50. J. Eberz, Die Bestimmung der von Platon entworfenen Trilogie Timaios Kritias Hermokrates. The discourses of the projected trilogy were never given by these men. But in the fragment, which belongs to the close of Plato's life, he

is narrating in imaginary Socratic form a personal experience, something that affected the Academy, who without explicit details would understand the guise and names chosen by him. In the person of Hermokrates we are to understand Dion who, under this name, declared himself to be the heir to Hermokrates' political theories. Who are referred to under the names Timaios and Kritias, we do not know, but they must have been close friends of Dion. The trilogy was thought of as the manifesto for Dion's insurrection. The three discourses originated from the spirit expressed on the two fateful days in the Academy, preceding Dion's departure. In the exposition of the rational state the Kritias and the Hermokrates were to be opposed to each other as the portrayal of the past to that of the immediate future; the *ἄλλος κατὰ* to the world of the present began with the fall of ancient Athens; the *ἄλλος ἀνω* to the ideal state by Dion's forcible establishment of the new Syracuse, was to be promised in the Hermokrates. The Timaios was planned as the common foundation for both works.

V, pp. 51-58. K. Preisendanz, Ein neuer Liebeszauber. Reconstruction of the text of a Greek incantation publ. by E. Breccia in Bull. de la Société arch. d'Alexandria IX (1907) n. 5. II 1, p. 95 f. A commentary is supplied below the text.

VI, pp. 59-70. O. Immisch, Zu Callimachus und Accius. Callimachus wrote a poem on grammatical and literary history which he called *γραφεῖον*, meaning apparently "archives", as if his learned studio were the *γραφεῖον* of the Museum and he himself a sort of official "literary notary". Accius' work on poetics should be called "Pragmaticus", not "Pragmatica". It was probably in nine books and treated of poetics under the rubrics, Epos, Drama, Lyric. Accius' Pragmaticus, like Horace's epistle to the Pisos, aims at giving advice to individuals. Both these works are "parangelmatic"; the Didascalici give the theoretic side. Proclus' *χρηστομάθεια γραμματική* shows a somewhat similar treatment of poetics, beginning with epos and ending with lyric. The title Pragmaticus points to a complete systematic method of presentation, such as could be found only in a grammatical handbook of poetics.

VII, pp. 71-113. F. Klingmüller, Die Idee des Staatseigentums am römischen Provinzialboden. From the very beginning new possessions were not incorporated with the state, but considered as appanages of the ruling power. The principles of ancient common law, such as the right of booty, underlie the whole system. Of the four classes of provincial communities (*civitates foederatae, liberae et immunes, decumanae, censoriae*) the last alone forfeited their land to the state domain. Normally, most of the land in the provinces remained in the 'precarious' possession of the owners, subject to certain contributions. If the Roman state sold land in the provinces to Roman citizens, the

buyers did not hold title *ex iure Quiritium*, but on an officially guaranteed tenure with inheritance and transfer rights, subject to a *vectigal*, a procedure imitated from the practice in certain parts of Italy. For political, not financial, reasons the nobles opposed granting provincial lands with a quiritary title, as appears from the troubles which occurred when C. Gracchus in 122 B. C. sent a colony to Carthage. The idea of state-ownership on provincial soil is seen in its purest form in the administration of those parts of the empire which the state retained as state domain under its own management; cities reduced by arms, and royal estates, which were leased by the censors to private parties. When C. Gracchus gave Asia over to the publicans, it was in order to help to overturn the Roman bureaucracy. Egypt was an exception in the Roman provincial organization. The *status quo* of the subjects as well as the bureaucratic and centralized political machine of the Ptolemies was maintained. The revenues went into the imperial fiscus. Private ownership of land continued as under the Ptolemies as is shown by the papyri. It is an interesting fact that from the very beginning Roman private law relations were influenced by the idea of state ownership on provincial soil.

VIII, pp. 114-125. W. A. Oldfather, *Funde aus Lokroi*. The discussion by Q. Quagliati (*Ausonia* III, 1909, 136-235) of the objects discovered in 1906 in the region of Lokroi Epizephyrioi in Contrada Manella, suggests several additional points bearing upon local and historical matters. The pinakes afford proof of the existence of a Dionysus cult at Lokroi. He appears as chthonic divinity and as *δενδρίτης* in conversation with Persephone and Hades. Hermes figures prominently as *Ψυχοπομπός* and as *Κριοφόρος*. Aphrodite appears in a wagon drawn by two winged demons, escorted by Hermes. Demeter, prominent in the mother city, becomes less so in the colony; one fragment shows her as a figure quite subordinate to Persephone. Hades remains completely in the background, for Persephone was the real divinity of death; the connection of the two in myth is an eighth century syncretism. Athene appears once on a decorative relief which had nothing to do with the cultus. The most significant pinakes have to do with the dead and the cult of the gods of the lower world and life in Elysium. The tree of Hades and the cock occur often. The temenos where these objects were found belonged to Persephone. The pinakes came from a chapel on the local acropolis, from which, rebuilt in the fifth century, they were dumped into the valley at the foot of the slope. The pinakes show that the Lokrian society had received strong Ionian influence. Also the religious thoughts of the people show a deep orphic-mystic feeling.

IX, pp. 116-140. A. J. Kronenberg, *Ad Minucium Felicem*. Critical notes.

X, pp. 141-152. A. Abt, *Nucularum hexas*. I. In Pap. Mimaut (ed. Wessely. *Denkschr. Acad. Wien*, 1889), v. 1 sqq., read ἀντιδίκων μου, as the curse is for the opponents in a law-suit. II. Pap. mag. Lond. 46, v. 109 sqq. W. K. Not only does the λόγος bear traces of Hebrew history, but the πρᾶξις also is made up to resemble the description, in Exodus XXVIII, vs. 36 f., of the clothing of the high priest. III. Annual of the Brit. School of Athens XIII, 1906-7, p. 100 f. The ivory carving of the eighth century B. C. shows a corpse on a bier; near this bier hovers the soul in a form conjectured to be that of a butterfly, though for such a representation of the soul an earlier date than the fifth century has not heretofore been noted. IV. Berlin pap. P. 9566, verso. A hitherto unedited magic papyrus much resembling pap. Lugdunensis V and W. V. "Praecepta luc-tandi" in Oxyr. pap. VI, p. 201 (No. 887 saec. III, p. Chr. n.) is really a magic papyrus enumerating from top to toe the parts of the puppet used in the incantation. VI. Some additional readings in Berl. pap. 7504 (a headache charm) by the help of Amherst pap., vol. II, pap. 2, page 11.

Miscellen.

1, pp. 153-155. M. Schneider [Theokrit], Id. XXVII 50. S. conjectures δικάζω (Doric for δικάσσω) for the corrupt διδάζω, in place of which a dozen substitutes had been suggested.

2, pp. 155-157. K. Lincke, *Zu Xen. Mem. I 1*, 17-19. The doubt of Gilbert as to the genuineness of this passage seems well founded. The last sentence misrepresents the attitude of Socrates toward divination.

3, pp. 157-159. S. Brandt, *Zu Lucians Hahn 24. 12 und Icaromen. 18*. In Gall. § 24, B. would bracket ἡ ἀστραπή. In Gall. § 12, ἐκκρίδεκα, and in Icaromen. § 18, ὀκτώ are not round numbers, but are to be taken literally.

4, p. 160. O. Crusius, *Grillparzer über die antike Bühne*. We see from Grillparzer's "Briefe literarischen und artistischen Inhalts" (Werke XIV 141 N.) that he held that the actors and the chorus must have played upon the same level.

XI, pp. 161-177. Fr. Boll, *Paralipomena*. I. Notes on various authors jotted down while he was working on articles for the Pauly-Wissowa *Realencyklopädie*.

1. In Horace's Ode I 2, the description of the flood has Archilochos, fr. 74 for its prototype. It is not necessary to assume that Horace used any intermediary source.

2. *Mercuriales viri* (Od. II 17) is to be taken as an astrological reference—men under the influence of the planet Mercury, Ἑρμῆϊκοί. The equation Faunus = Pan is sufficiently attested for Horace and the Augustan poets, "Faunus, Mercurialium custos virorum" is illustrated by the 'Anonymus' (379 A. D.) *Catal.*

codd. astr. gr. V 1, p. 211, 4: οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων τοῦ Αἰγόκερω καὶ οἱ Ἑριφοὶ καὶ ἡ Αἶξ διὰ Πανός ἢ δι' Ἑρμοῦ τὰς βοηθείας ἢ τὰς ἐπιφανείας ποιούσιν.

3. Cic. de div. I 121: read *armis* and omit *proelio*. The eclipse took place Feb. 13, 338 B. C., and is inexactly described. In the prophecy 'fighting' but not a single 'battle' would be referred to.

4. Cic. Somn. Scip. § 17: for ex quibus *unum* globum possidet illa (st:lla) quam in terris Saturniam nominant, read *summum*. Supported by Firmicus Maternus, Math. I 10, 14, who compiles from Cicero.

5. Firm. Math. I, § 5: read *etiam* de bono ac malo, which gives the necessary sense.

6. Between Achilleus Tatios, p. 42, 12 ff. and Musaios, 'Hero and Leander', v. 90-108, the original must have been Achilleus, although he goes back to Plato's Phaidros.

7. Firm. Matern. Math. II 10: The constellation Aries is described as signum solstitiale regale ignitum *ad laniandum*. In the excerpts of Rhetorios from Teukros (Catal. codd. astr. gr. VII 192 ff., Aries is described as a ζῳδιὸν τροπικὸν ἰσημερινὸν . . . βασιλικὸν . . . διάπυρον μελοκοπούμενον. Hence read in Firmicus Vulg. Lat. *adlaniandum*, (used as a pres. pass. ptc.) or the simple *laniandum*, in which case *ad* would be a later insertion.

8. In Aristoph. Frogs 942, ἐπυλλίοις = ἐπὶ φαιῖς, 'charms'. In v. 906 f. εἰκόνας refers, as Tucker has shown, to witty comparisons. Cf. Plato Symp. 215 A and Hug's note.

XII, pp. 178-251. Leo Weber, Apollon Pythoktonos im phrygischen Hierapolis. The original local cult at Hierapolis was that of Kybele, whose shrine was over a cleft in a rock whence issued mephitic vapors. Later a shrine of the Greek Apollo was erected just above it, but it failed to stamp out the Asiatic worship. Instead a syncretism resulted, and the worship of Apollo received symbols and elements from the cult of Kybele, the latter persisting well into the sixth century A. D. This syncretism is proved by passages from Damaskios (ca. 526 A. D.) preserved by Photios, especially, p. 344^b, 35, and by the fact that other Asiatic divinities were identified or associated with Apollo (v. coins and inscriptions). The *Acta Philippi* (acta apostolorum apocrypha ed. Lipsius et Bonnet, II 2, p. 41) as interpreted by Weber, shows that the chthonic divinity worshipped at Hierapolis in rock and cave, the *ἑχιδνα*, was Kybele. Hierapolis itself was called Ὀφιορύμη. Apollo the slayer of Python of Delphi was thought of as battling with the *ἑχιδνα*-Kybele worship of Hierapolis, a conception illustrated on several coins and medallions. Under the empire there was a close relation existing between Asia Minor and Delphi, occasioned by the needs of Hellenism in its decisive struggle for existence in Asia. At the time of the *Acta Philippi* Christianity was aiming its

weapons at the Kybele-worship. Among the ruins of Hierapolis are the ruins of two basilicas, perhaps those of Philip and his daughters (Euseb. H. Eccl. III 31, 4).

XIII, pp. 252-263. S. Haupt, Die zwei Bücher des Aristoteles *περὶ ποιητικῆς τέχνης*. Summary on p. 256. There were once two books to this treatise cited down to Proklos (410-485 A. D.). The Peripatetics after 530 A. D. allude to only one. The technical terms referred to in our treatise, in some cases are unintelligible without a previous explanation. Furthermore the discussion of harmony, metre, rhythm, lyric (inclusive of the dithyramb), auletic, and citharistic must have preceded the work as we have it. These could not have been handled in the Politics. Finally the theory of catharsis may have been developed in the first book of the Poetics. Therefore our book is the second. The first book was lost through fault of the Peripatetics of the sixth century, who could not fit it into their *organum*.

XIV, pp. 264-291. W. Capelle, Zur Geschichte der griechischen Botanik. Plut. Quaest. Conviv. III 1, 3, uses a lost medico-pharmacological treatise which discussed at length the action of liquor on the brain and the peculiar reactions of certain plant-perfumes. In it was also a study of the etymology of the names of plants as a proof for the physiological effect of the narcotics. This treatise cited Andreas, an Alexandrian physician, probably the one Galen XIX, 105, mentions among the *γράφαντες τὰς ὀνομασίας τῶν φαρμάκων*. The source used by Plut. Quaest. Conv. III 2, p. 648c, on the heat of the ivy-plant, was a botanical treatise which shows acquaintance with Theophrastos. II. The earliest Greek writer on botany was Menestor of Sybaris who may have lived before Empedokles. III. There can be no doubt that Theophrastos' real theory of the causation of evergreenness and deciduousness has been lost.

XV, pp. 292-318. A. Müller, Studentenleben im 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (1) The schools of the litterator, grammaticus, and rhetor. (2) The higher branches were often taught privately, but subsidies were often given to philosophers and rhetors by emperors and cities. There was a law school at Rome, Constantinople, Berytos and Alexandria. Medicine and specialties like music and astronomy were studied in the house of the teacher. (3) Students began the higher branches at 16 (Eunapios), 17 (Augustinus), 18 (architects under Constantine). Because of this early age many precautions were taken by parents and preceptors to care for the welfare of the students. Corporal punishment was practised in the fourth century by rhetors and others. Advanced study was costly. Matriculation was easy in the East; at Rome it was more formal. Interpretation of authors, handling of themes, listening to the lectures and the show-pieces of sophists and philosophers, and trials in the

courts constituted much of the curriculum. Lectures were held in private, rented, or public halls. Owing to the vivacity of the southern temperament the deportment of the students left something to be desired (Quint. Inst. or. II 2, 12, Libanios I, p. 63). Lectures were in the forenoon. Vacation began in mid-summer. Student pranks were common.

Miscellen.

5, pp. 318-319. M. Schneider, *Orpheus Argonautica*, v. 1072. Read *ὑγρή* for *ὑλη* of MSS.

6, pp. 319-320. S. Eitrem, *Catulliana*. In Carm. 116, 1 read *versa ante* for *venante*: i. e., poema quod iamdudum magna diligentia in Latinum sermonem transtuli tibi dedicaturus fui.

2. Carm. 66, 59, should read: hic lumen vario ne solum in culmine coeli.

XVI, pp. 321-326. C. F. H. Bruchmann, *Alte Athenahymnen, Lamprokles oder Phrynichos?* The hymn referred to in Aristophanes' *Clouds* 967, and ascribed by the Scholiasts to Lamprokles, or Phrynichos, or Stesichoros, is probably older and by some long forgotten poet. By the aid of the scholia and an echo in Kallimachos Hymn. V 43 f., the opening verses are reconstructed:

Παλλάδα περσέπολιν, δεινὰν θεὸν ἐγρεκύδοιμον,
εὐπήληκα ποτικλήζω, πολεμαδόκον, ἀγνάν,
παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου δαμάσιππον, παρθένον αἰεὶ.

XVII, pp. 327-358. J. Kayser, *Theophrast und Eustathius περὶ ὑποκρίσεως*. The text of chapters XII and XVI of Eustathius, *de Simulatione*, is given with commentary and translation. Its similarity to Theophrastus' *Characters* (which Eustathius mentions in *Comment. in Iliad.*, p. 931, 20) is considered, and the Peripatetic (especially Theophrastian) influence is analyzed. It is concluded that a 'Character', the *ὑποκριτής*, has been lost from Theophrastus, owing to its similarity to the *κόλαξ* (cf. the merging of two Characters in number V). In Byzantine times more were extant. The book *περὶ ὑποκρίσεως* of Theophrastus listed by Diog. Laert. V 48 was probably not a rhetorical work. Its contents were perhaps like his *περὶ κολακείας* (Diog. Laert. V 47); it may have been to a degree historical, and have discussed stage and oratorical delivery.

XVIII, pp. 359-374. Th. Steinwender, *Gefechtstellung und Taktik der Manipulare*. Continuation of the study of the *quincunx* formation of the Roman maniples (*Philol.*, 1909, p. 260 ff.). The front of the line extended as many paces plus the breadth of one man as there were files less one; the depth as many paces plus the thickness of a man as there were ranks less one. In battle the members behind did not march up: but the ranks were distended. The secret of the maniple's superiority rests not in the shock of a phalanx formation, but in stationary fighting

with continual changing of the division units in the line of battle and the files (Treffen u. Glieder).

XIX, pp. 375-410. T. Schermann: *Εὐχαριστία* und *εὐχαριστεῖν* in ihrem Bedeutungswandel bis 200 n. Chr. The words occur in Hippocrates (c. 430), but are rare before the Hellenistic times. In the three centuries before Christ they are most current in Asia Minor and Egypt, the verb developing such a variety of meanings and constructions that in profane and religious literature there is hardly any new use to be found. The idea of 'being thankful' is generally present; but it also = *εὐχομαι*. In the Judaistic literature, LXX and Philo, they play a peculiar rôle. In LXX *ἐξομολογεῖσθαι* and *αἰνεῖν* are used for thanks or praise to God. In Philo *εὐχαριστία* is technically used for prayer of thanksgiving at sacrifices; also of a "thankoffering" to God, and again as "goodwill". In NT the verb means, (1) to offer thanks at table, (2) *τινί*, to be thankful, (3) *τινὶ ἐπὶ τινι* or *περί τινος* = to thank someone on account of or for someone or something, (4) *τί τινι, ὅτι . . .* = to thank someone for something because, (5) *ὑπέρ τινος . . . ἵνα* = to pray for someone (or for the sake of something) that, (6) *τι ὑπέρ τινος* = to obtain something for someone by entreaty. In early Christian literature *εὐχαριστία* is used for "religious meal", "prayer on the occasion of a meal", *σὰρξ Χριστοῦ*, and 'the part of the worship concerned with the Lord's supper'. The verb in Ignatius = to thank. In Justin *εὐχαριστία* = *θυσία*, and 'Christian prayer of thanks in the name of the crucified Jesus'. Clemens Alex. and Origen generally use it as 'element of the Lord's supper'. There is a summary of the development of meanings on p. 410.

XX, pp. 411. F. Pfister, *Die στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* in den Briefen des Apostels Paulus. The much discussed phrase in Gal. 4, 3 and 8, and Col. 2, 8 and 20 is interpreted as referring to the demonology of the Greek world, the terminology of which was influenced by the Platonic philosophy. The proof is based on the phraseology of certain passages in the Alexander romance, the magic papyri, and the late demonology of the Byzantine Michael Psellos. The latter, after declaring the whole cosmos to be full of demons, classifies them as (1) *τὸ διάπυρον* (2) *αἱετοὶ δαίμονες* (3) *τὸ χθόνιον* (4) *τὸ ὑδραῖον καὶ ἐνάλιον* (5) *τὸ ὑποχθόνιον* (6) *τὸ μισοφαῖς καὶ δυσαίσθητον*. This corresponds to the *κοσμικὰ στοιχεῖα* of the papyri, the Platonic divisions in Timaios XII, p. 39 E, those of the author of the Epinomis, and the *λόγος διδασκαλικὸς τῶν Πλάτωνος δογμάτων* of Albinos. Thus St. Paul's reference to *φιλοσοφία* and *ἀπάτη* is explained.

XXI, pp. 428-439. W. Schonack, *Coniectanea in nonnulla scripta Hippocratea*. I. De prisca medicina. II. De fractis. III. De praenotionibus.

Miscellen.

7, pp. 440-442. W. Schmid, Nachtrag zu den Fragmenta

Stoicorum veterum. The two definitions of grammar ascribed to Ariston in the introductory chapter of Marius Victorinus (Keil G. L. VI) are taken to be authentic, and so Ariston, a hundred years earlier than Diogenes of Seleukeia, must be accepted as the founder of Stoic grammar.

8, pp. 443-446. W. Süss, *Kleinigkeiten*. (1) Interpretation of a *latrina* inscription. (2) Aristoph. *Plutus* 267 is emended *χολός* for *ψωλός* on the basis of Lucian's excursus on the lame *Plutus* in his *Timon*. (3) *Priapea* c. LXXV B: the reading of the MSS is kept. In *Priap.* c. LXXX B, vs. 4 is to be read as a question. In c. XVIII B, *extis aptius* should be *extricatus* = *expeditus*. c. LII B is interpreted.

9, pp. 446-447. H. Uhle, *Zu Soph. Antig.* 710. οὔτοι διαπυχθέντες ὥφθησαν κενοί is explained by reference to Plato *Symp.* 215 B, σειληνοί . . . οἱ διχάδε διοιχθέντες φαίνονται ἐνδοθεν ἀγάλματα ἔχοντες θεῶν, i. e. the figures opened like our mechanical toys. Haimon then says that when certain people are opened and examined there is nothing to be found inside.

10, pp. 447-448. P. Maas, *ὑμνημέναια*. This is the MS tradition in Nonnos 16, 290; 24, 271. So also Dioskurides AP. VII 407, 5 and Oppianos *Kyneg.* 1, 341. For the ending, cf. *αἶλαια*, which Nonnos (after Kallim. *Hymn. Ap.* 20) often uses substantively.

11, p. 448. A. Abt, *Nachtrag zu S.* 141 ff. Several corrections.

XXII, pp. 449-465. Fr. Zucker, *Zu den Klagschriften mit Schlussbitte um Registrierung*. Some modifications of L. Mitteis' conclusions, "Zur Lehre von den Libellen und der Prozesseinleitung nach den Papyri der früheren Kaiserzeit" (*Bericht. der Sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss.* Bd. 62, p. 61 ff.). The closing petition addressed to the strategos (or sometimes to the centurio) generally read: ἀξιῶ ἐν καταχωρισμῷ γενέσθαι τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίδιον πρὸς τὸ φανέντος τοῦ δέινος μένειν μοι τὸν λόγον. *καταχωρισμός* is the official's book of entry, registry in which is asked for, if preliminary procedure cannot be instituted against the accused. Mitteis held that a case was thus brought to the cognizance of the authorities, but the time for bringing accusation was held open. Sometimes twofold memorials are presented. In the prosecution of offences of minor importance official action as well as officially authorized private action can be instituted.

XXIII, pp. 466-478. J. Baunack, *Die Abkürzung γαι in argivischen Inschriften*. γαι apparently stood for *γενόμενος ἀπελεύθερος*.

XXIV, pp. 479-488. E. Kalinka, *Zu Caesars Schriften*. I. The *Anticatones*. Of the two known to antiquity, the later was Caesar's, the first was by Hirtius. II. The dedicatory letter to

the eighth commentary de bello Gallico. The allusion to an *imperfectus commentarius* is to an *incohatus de bello Alexandrino*. III. The title to the commentary on the war in the province of Africa was probably "de bello *Africae*" and neither *Africo* nor *Africano*.

XXV, pp. 489-550. Th. Stangl, *Asconiana. Sprachliche und textkritische Untersuchungen*.

XXVI, pp. 557-565. W. Soltau, *Die Diktatorenjahre*. The four years "sine consulibus" which in the *Fasti* now pass as years of dictators, always stood as years in the consular lists, and their existence can even yet be traced in the annalistic narrative, which included the events in them with another year. For the sake of chronological adjustment they were passed over in the *annales maximi*, whereas a year was each time noted in the *fasti*. The years were officially regarded as annexes to the adjacent consulate, and were reckoned in only in the summing up of the years of office, though omitted in a natural count according to calendar years.

Miscellen.

12, pp. 566-567. H. Uhle, *Zu Odyssee* μ 101 f. ἀλλήλων = τοῦ ἐτέρου.

13, pp. 567-569. H. Kling, *Hilarius von Poitiers und Sallust*. The influence is seen not in the affectation of Hilary's introductions as some have thought, but in certain phrases and turns of expression found in the introduction of his chief work, *de trinitate*.

14, pp. 569-570. G. Helmreich, *Gaitanus-Γαϊτανός*. (Zu Marcellus Empiricus.) The word (in 8, 27) as is clearly shown from Galen method. med. XIV 22 (= Vol. X 942 K) is a Celtic loan-word, and whether adjective or substantive refers to a kind of cord recommended for its aseptic quality.

15, pp. 570-571. O. Crusius, *Der gepeitschte Dämon*. Echo of a scene from an ancient mime in Fr. Hebbel, *Genoveva*, Act IV Sc. VI. H.'s verse: "Ich thu' mir weh, damit du's fühlst und weichst", though it is not likely that the author knew the ancient source, sounds like a paraphrase of ἐμάστιξεν ἑαυτήν, ὡς δῆθεν τὴν Ἑκάτην ἐκ τούτου λυπούσα. ('*Paroemiographica*' by O. Cr. in *Sitzungsber. d. bayr. Akademie*, 1910, IV, S. 54 f.)

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

BRIEF MENTION.

If philology in its fine antique sense did not embrace the whole of life, I should say that not a few unphilological books find their way to the Editor's table, and no matter how often said Editor repeats to himself the ancient saying 'Non omnis aetas, Lyde, ludo convenit', these are not the least tempting of the long array of Books Received. But the book I am about to mention falls well within the philological range. If, as Calderon has it, 'Life is a Dream', why is not the life of language a dream also? 'Literature is a living psychology', says Taine, which according to Bourget, who deals in psychology, is a profound definition. If so, syntax is an organon of psychology; and what enters more truly into psychological study than the phenomena of dreams? Quite apart then from the fascination of its style, HAVELOCK ELLIS's *World of Dreams* (Houghton Mifflin Co.) might well attract the attention of the syntactician. The discourse on levitation has interested me particularly for the personal reason that it recalls my studies in Philostratus' Life of Apollonius with the instance, not mentioned by ELLIS, of 'Brahminical gentlemen dancing on nothing two cubits from the ground' (Essays and Studies, p. 266). But there is no example of levitation on record that has given more trouble to the Brahmins of Syntax than the flight from optative to potential in the Syntax of the Moods. To those matter of fact souls who keep their feet on the ground the passage is impossible. Nearly sixty years ago the cry was raised 'Have we a Bourbon among us?' It has been succeeded of late years by a more frantic cry 'Have we a Potential among us?' There are those who maintain that the wish is a potential with its bottom knocked out. There are those who maintain that the wish is father to the thought, and that the will is a reinforced wish. Imperative, imperative subjunctive, modal future, optative and optative with *ā*, pass into one another like the tinted clouds of sunset. Now the world of dreams, it appears, is a primal world, and in our dreams we go back to the early life of the race and to the early life of language. In sleep we assume the attitude of the embryo, and in dreams the dog and his master are two of a kind. The murders we commit in our sleep are the genial murders of long ago, and like Walt Whitman's animals we are not troubled about our sins. If we feel remorse, we are on the edge of waking up, we are in a 'hypnonompic' state. It would be interesting to know whether a dreaming grammarian would have any scruples about breaking Priscian's head or murdering the King's English.

But that is a minor matter in comparison with the beautiful simplification of the theory of the optative. Behind the symbolism of dreams, says Freud, 'that most daring and original psychologist', as Mr. ELLIS calls him, there lies ultimately a wish. 'The mechanism of dreams is far from exhibiting mere disordered mental activity; it is the outcome of a desire which is driven back by a kind of inhibition or censure' (p. 165). There could be no better description of the potential optative. Doubtless in the early stages of Greek the historical endings of the optative served as a manner of inhibition or censure, but as time went on the Greek, with its admirable sense of moderation, clapped the inhibition of an *ἄν*, the censure of a *κεν*, on its optative, and made it walk sedately between the indicative and the imperative, or, to recur to the old figure, if the wish is father to the thought, the Greek father provides a *παιδαγωγός* for his offspring to guard him against the seductions of *Ἴμερος* and *Πόθος*. To be sure, Mr. ELLIS is not quite in accord with Freud. But that is a mere detail, and I will not allow my illustration to be spoiled by any 'hypnopompic' process.

This dream-theory assuredly satisfies after a fashion the conditions of the optative and may be welcome to those who are weary of the *distinguo's* of recent grammarians, to those who say, as I have said, that the men who used Latin and Greek as native tongues were not guilty of all these subtleties to themselves. Why, for that matter, what Frenchman dissects his 'j'irai' into 'shall' and 'will' (A. J. P. XXIII 246)? Of course, this impatience of analysis may be set down to the feebleness of age. For, as we get old, Thomas a Kempis becomes dearer to us, and we say with him: 'Quanto aliquis magis sibi unitus et simplicatus fuerit, tanto plura et altiora sine labore intelligit, quia desuper lumen intelligentiae accipit' (I, 3): and nothing has touched me more of late years than to find that Professor SONNENSCHN, though twenty years my junior, begins to feel as I do, the inevitable attraction of the simple life in grammar, as elsewhere. Here is the man who divides the crown of the Prospective Subjunctive with Professor Hale, that Prospective Subjunctive which has been accepted as a finality by eminent students of comparative grammar; and yet in his *Unity of the Latin Subjunctive* (London, John Murray) enters a plea for the subjunctive one and indivisible, and finds in the 'shall' and 'should' subjunctive the solution of all our troubles with the mixed mood. Up to this time, advanced thinkers have gained great renown by dividing and subdividing the Latin subjunctive, by erecting into psychological categories all the possible translations of the subjunctive, such as flourished in the old-fashioned Latin grammars—renderings, such as 'may, can, might, would, could

or should' (A. J. P. XIX 231). And now comes Professor SONNENSCHN and settles down on the 'shall' subjunctive as the bower anchor of our *navis grammaticorum*. Take all the uses of 'shall' through all the centuries of English (A. J. P. XXX 7) and reinforce the weak places by the German 'sollen', and the result is a fair show of unity; but the diversity of this unity is as great as the diversity of the old diversity. 'Shall' is the other side of 'will', and the spectre of the will comes back, the 'will' that makes the 'shall' (A. J. P. XXXI 79).

When, more than a generation ago, I was about to dismiss my first class in Pindar, I ran through the odes with my men, and pointed out all the famous quotations. There were not many of them, hardly a double handful, to measure that ambrosial food as we used to measure corn to our horses during the Civil War. 'That', I said, 'is all that "elegant scholarship" will require you to know of Pindar, that and Horace's "Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari"'. Pindar was not popular then, nor would my ironical valedictory have been untimely years and years afterwards, when I read in an English journal the confession of some one who had achieved First Honours in Classics and whose knowledge of Pindar was limited to the First Olympian and Jebb's Pindaric translation of Browning's Abt Vogler. But England would not be England, if it did not harbor eccentricities, and in 1880 I made the acquaintance of one admirable Pindaric scholar who had kept his knowledge to himself instead of parading it, as is the manner of most of us; and I thought of him the other day when my eye lighted on the following paragraph in the Dial:

James Payne, the novelist, told the story of an old English scholar who insisted that all modern literature was contained in Pindar. 'What!' asked Mr. Payne, 'You don't mean to say that Browning's Ring and the Book is in Pindar?' 'Yes', said the scholar, 'in the highest and truest sense, the Ring and the Book is contained in Pindar.'

It is true that for the last two decades and more Pindar has not been so much neglected in England, but with the increase of knowledge reaction has set in, and if those who know Pindar continue to harp upon his poverty of thought and crudeness of metaphor (A. J. P. XXVI 360; XXVII 483), the next generation will hardly be more familiar with the poet than was the last. Quoting Latin is out of fashion, quoting Greek quite obsolete, or it might be maintained that no Greek poet of the same bulk of authorship lends himself so readily to quotation as Pindar; and last summer, being off on a holiday and separated from all Greek books except a text of Pindar, I amused myself with constructing a Pindaric Calendar after the fashion of the familiar Shakespeare Calendar, and had no difficulty in finding three

hundred and sixty-five quotations—one for each day of the year. To be sure, there are recurrences of thought. There are gods enough for Sundays and Natures enough for week ends, for Phya looms in Pindar as Phye did in the procession of Peisistratos; but for all that there are pat mottoes for every phase of modern life and for all the emergencies of modern politics. Commonplaces? Yes, there are commonplaces, but do we not all live by commonplaces? What gave ‘good old Mantuan’ his vogue for two centuries except his copy-book sentences? ‘Semel insanivimus omnes’ has become as familiar a quotation as any in the whole list of household words, though few of us stop at ‘semel’. But the famous ‘Carmelite’, whom Professor MUSTARD has brought back to life for most of us, is as hopelessly ‘homely’ as Pindar is hopelessly unapproachable in his distinction. What if Pindar does repeat himself in thought? There is wonderful variety in the phrasing, for he is as proud of his ποικιλία as Plato was of his. However, that is an old story, broidered by all the commentators on Pindar. But the other point, the aptness of Pindar’s verses as electric signs for our times, might bear one or two illustrations. ‘Hands across the sea’ is tersely Anglo-Saxon, but οἰκοθεν οἰκαδε is as tersely Greek, and means more for an Anglo-American alliance; and the cry that is ringing in our ears ‘See America first’ is an echo of οἰκοθεν μάτενε. ‘Dollar diplomacy’ is one manifestation of ὁ πλοῦτος εὐρυσθενής and τὰν ἔμπρακτον ἀντλεῖ μηχανάν might answer for a treatise on Pragmatism.

I did not go so far as to distribute these three hundred and sixty-five quotations among the days of the year, but when a friend, who evidently thought I might have been better employed, asked me what I was going to do with the very first and most famous of all Pindaric sayings, ἀριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, the answer was obvious. ‘It goes under Aquarius’. Under Virgo we should have Kyrene. Under Gemini the stately Third Olympian and the lovely Tenth Nemean. Crabbed verses there are enough for Cancer, stinging verses there are enough for Scorpio. There is hardly room in Sagittarius for all Pindar’s arrows, and Herakles as a sun-god ramps through all the signs of the Zodiac. The compactness of Pindar, to which I have just referred, constitutes one of his great charms for minds of a certain order; and the same thing may be said of Greek and Latin generally. The most read book to-day in Continental Europe, according to Marcel Prévost, is the Danish novel he has translated at second hand, ‘L’Âge Dangereux’. Now I try to keep up with all ages, and so I have read the book, in a very different frame of mind from that in which Dionysos read the Andromeda, and as I threw it aside never to be touched again, I said to myself: What is there in the whole thing that is not substantially

contained in Master Ovid's 'Quae venit exacto tempore peius amat', a verse that I have been applying these sixty years? Last summer the chief of my diet was Mr. Grundy's Thucydides and the History of his Age, which interested me so much that I made an abstract of it, as I am apt to do in like case (A. J. P. XXIII 446). But as I closed the volume, which was for me an instructive, indeed, an illuminating book, the chief impress left on my mental retina might have been summed up in a slightly altered verse of my detested Persius, 'Magister artis *imperique* largitor Venter'. But, after all, we have good authority for saying that life is not made up of foodstuffs and channels of trade, as I have had occasion to say before in the case of Mr. Cornford (A. J. P. XXVIII 356). πολλῆς εὐθείας, says Diodotos (Th. 3, 45, 7), ὅστις οἴεται τῆς ἀνθρωπείας φύσεως ὀρμωμένης προθύμως τι πράξαι ἀποτροπὴν τινα ἔχειν ἢ νόμων ἰσχύι ἢ ἄλλῳ τῷ δεινῷ, such as the loss of business. A recent writer characterizes the whole theory as 'the puerile inversion which makes of history an economic phenomenon'; and the state of affairs in Tripoli to-day may serve to furnish forth a practical commentary on the same.

The random remark of the fantastic Pindarist, which I have quoted above, set me to reading—or rather rereading after many years—*The Ring and the Book*, moved further thereto by a recent perusal of the Old Yellow Book, which, to be frank, has for anyone familiar with handling original documents more real life in it than all the figures and fancies and philosophies that the genius of Browning has conjured out of it. Of course, as a grammarian of the narrow sort, I have little patience with Browning; and I am tempted to carry out the suggestion of an eminent scholar, once a thrall of Browning, who wrote to me some months ago, à propos of A. J. P. XXXII 241: 'You might have something stringent to say about his abuses of English syntax'. To me the English language, which I worship, however ignorantly, is a sacred thing; and he who does despite to the body of it, who deliberately twists its sinews and dislocates its joints is a cruel monster, no matter what his genius; and such a monster of genius is Browning. I am not discussing his style, his inversions, his tiresome alliterations, his parentheses or what the Chicago ladies call in baseball parlance his curves. Nor do I find fault with the suppression of the relative. That is a return to the glorious liberty of the sons of the days of Elizabeth. But Browning's infinitives are to the grammatical soul so many mopping and mowing fiends; and it is this antigrammatical perverseness that makes it hard for me to follow up his other perversenesses. There are hard writers, there are obscure writers. Some of the greatest writers are hard writers, and we must submit to their conditions. But obscure writers deserve the

blackness of darkness of the bottomless pit. The perverse writer spits in your face, and such an one is Browning.

Now, the trouble is that what is perverse to one is not perverse to another. And with the decline of reading, the allusive style is especially taboo. If the surface meaning is perfectly plain, the cryptic meaning adds for the initiated a peculiar charm, not a vulgar wink, but a half-smile, a narrowing of the eyelids—a favorite contention of mine (A. J. P. XXXI 487; XXXII 113). But the circle of the initiated is getting smaller, and readers are becoming more and more suspicious and irritable. This is notoriously the case with the use of Scriptural language, which a recent critic of Matthew Arnold (A. J. P. XXXII 113) says it is good form to 'eschew', as if the survival of 'eschew' itself were not due to the Authorized Version. The use of Scriptural phraseology was—in some cases is still—a matter of environment. But the environment is rapidly falling away, and we old-fashioned men say 'more's the pity'. That high language belongs to the high sphere, just as Thukydides' tragic language suits the tragic crisis of the Peloponnesian war. The inevitable loss of Biblical phraseology will be a loss to the language, and I am always comforted when I see indications that the Authorized Version will last my time. So the other day I found that Professor Royce, a young man as I count youth, in his recent discourse of William James abounds in language which in a later generation will be set down as perverse allusion.

Of course, Browning is full of Scriptural allusions, and one of his worshippers has gathered them up in a book. That feature of style is of his time, as it is of mine, and I forgive the occasional lapses in accuracy, some of which have been pointed out in Mrs. Machen's book, and some, though corrected in later editions, have been retained in the popular reprint of Everyman's Library. One of his characters—a monk of all men—is made to ask, 'Who was it dared lay hands upon the ark?' (Pope 1482). Of course, the answer is 'Uzzah', a bit of Sunday School lore which ought not to have been above the level of the most ignorant friar. But in *Tertium Quid* (833) the original reading was 'So a fool once touched the ark—poor Hophni I'—awkwardly corrected afterwards into 'poor Uzzah that I am'. The vulgar error that makes Simeon's sign, Simeon's prayer, occurs over and over again, though the 'Nunc dimittas' of Everyman's Library (T. Q. 338) does not appear in the standard editions. But all Browning's errors are to be set down either to his dramatic genius or to poetic whimsicality; and it is not worth while to

pursue the subject. His classical allusions are not recondite, and his reference to Pindar's Seventh Olympian, 'Richer than the gold shower Jove rained on Rhodes', is rather trivial. But with one Greek poet Browning has made himself familiar, and his Aristophanic studies have borne fruit. And such fruit, fruit that reminds me of the balsam-apple, much affected in the gardens of the South when I was a boy. To my eyes it is one of the most shameless of the vegetable kingdom, a shameless kingdom at any rate, as Jean Paul remarks of the chaste lily. I do not care to go into particulars, but one specimen I will not suppress. αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἐσμεν . . . νῦν γε περιεπτισμένοι. I am writing for Grecians. Greek does not blush, and when that spoiled darling of the Muses, Aristophanes, sings: τοῦ μὲν μέγα καὶ παχύ, τῆς δ' ἡδὺ τὸ σῦκον we remember the licence of hymeneal songs, ancient and modern, and forgive him. But Browning I cannot forgive for putting in the mouth of his heroine (Pompilia, v. 873) the indecent parable of Canon Girolamo, in which the figure of the fig is elaborated. But in spite of Pliny's express recommendation of a fig diet for old men, me pascunt olivae | me cichorea levesque malvae, and I leave the theme of the influence of Aristophanes upon Browning outside the Apology to the diligent scholar who started the discussion (A. J. P. XXXI 487). Erotic parables and *doubles ententes* are really more indecent than the crudest naturalism, but harmless parallels may be had for the seeking, and I dismiss the subject with a marginal note on Av. 1248, which I jotted down some years ago while reading the late Mr. Lummis's Land of Poco Tiempo (p. 231).

Todos dicen que soy un viejo—
Yo no sé en que se pueden fundar
Yo me encuentro tan gordo y robusto
Que tres veces me puedo casar.

A pedant is an unlovely object. Imagine the fastidious gentleman of whom we are told by Mr. Conybeare (A. J. P. XXVII 105) coming to that verse on which, according to St. Paul, all the faith of a Christian pivots, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἡγέρθη, and laying down the book with some such comment as this:

ὧδε should be ἐνθάδε. According to the express statement of ancient critics ὧδε is not used locally in Homer. There is scant warrant for it in classic Greek prose, and in point of fact it is characteristically Hellenistic. So the phrase ὧδε κάκεισε, which one finds in Lucian's Hermotimus c. 1, and in A. P. XI 162 κάκεισε καὶ ὧδε. Compare the provincial 'hither and yon' and 'back and forth'.

There is a good deal of this cheap learning in Browning, and the excuse of dramatic propriety will not serve to excuse would-be erudite references to Catullus' 'chasm' in the pentameter and to

the false iambus in the sixth foot of the scazon. And when this cheap learning is inaccurate to boot, one is provoked to comment, and I may have seemed to emphasize unduly the weakness of a great poet and great thinker, whom I admire in my way. But before dismissing Browning from the confines of *Brief Mention* I cannot withhold a note which these strictures of mine have elicited from a valued correspondent, W. H. B., a note worth more in my eyes than many *Brief Mentions*.

W. H. B.:

Observe a pompion-twine afloat:
Pluck me one cup from off the Castle-moat—
Along with cup you raise leaf, stalk and root,
The entire surface of the pool to boot.
(Sordello, p. 76: Moxon's ed. 1840.)

'Pompion', I suppose, is Browningese for some kind of water-lily; as no pumpkin ever grew, or could grow, in the water. In another place he has

Gourds fried in great purple slices.
(The Englishman in Italy.)

Now whether anybody ever fried and ate gourds, I will not take upon me to say; but I know that while there are green, white, yellow, and orange gourds, there never was a purple gourd in *rerum natura*. He meant egg-plants. Browning, it is pretty clear, did not know much about vegetables. I have always suspected that this poet, who had so wonderful a perception of the workings of the human heart, was not vividly impressed by ordinary phenomena of external nature. *Extraordinary* phenomena which he *imagined*, are vivid enough; *e. g.*, the strange and ghastly scenery in "Childe Roland". Yet here he is absurdly false to nature and the law of gravitation. The scene is a vast plain:

gray plain all round:
Nothing but plain to the horizon's bound.

Yet in the midst of this plain Roland comes upon a swift torrent—

A sudden little river crossed my path

.....
No sluggish tide congenial to the glooms;
This, as it frothed by, might have been a bath
For the fiend's glowing hoof—to see the *wrath*
Of its *black eddy bespate with flakes and spumes*.

Now this is a mountain torrent, impossible and inconceivable in the midst of a vast level plain; and the reader cannot possibly visualize the scene. Tennyson would never have written that. I believe he never makes a slip, and his memory was like a photograph. I once thought he slipped when he wrote

opening chestnut-buds began
To spread into the perfect fan—

for the chestnut has no conspicuous bud, and the leaf is not at all fan-like. But I learned that what they call "chestnut" in England, is our horse-chestnut, which has a large and very conspicuous leaf-bud, and this, opening, discloses a palmate leaf of five or seven leaflets.

Tennyson caught and remembered little phenomena that others overlooked. A lovely example occurs in 'The Brook':

I make the *netted* sunbeam dance
Against my sandy shallows.

Now a swift-moving stream has a double system of ripples or wavelets reflected from the two banks, and the decussation where they meet and cross refracts the sunlight into an exquisite dancing net on a shallow sandy bottom. Everybody has seen this; but it was left for Tennyson to put it into verse.

'My old Condillac', says Anatole France, 'asserts that the most intelligent beings are those that are most capable of making mistakes'. I haven't opened Condillac since I read him in order to thicken the very thin gruel that passed for Mental Philosophy in my college days, sixty odd years ago, and I am not going to verify the quotation. The aphorism is almost a truism to one who has had much experience in philological matters. Flaws in Classical Research are apt to gape wide for the very men that seek for them in others. The very qualities that enable a man to generalize tempt him to a leap that lands him in a crevasse. 'Seest thou a man diligent in his business?' One expects the next clause of the verse 'He shall stand before kings'. But Fate skips a few verses and declares 'There is more hope of a fool than of him'. Seest thou a man meticulous in the matter of proof-reading, a man who avoids more cautiously than viper's blood the grease spot of a typographical blunder, a man who calls to his help a like spirit blest with keener eyes and the 'suspicious mind' that Bentley demands of the scholar? And yet when that man surveys the back numbers of the Journal he is plunged in despair by the sudden revelation of some astonishing oversight. So in my article on the Seventh Nemean I find that in two places *Hōra*, well named in this case ἡ ἐπειγομένη, has taken the place of *Hera* (A. J. P. XXXI 143, l. 23; 145, l. 2), and in another passage the same malapert Ὠρα has rushed in where *Karpō* (l. c. 132, l. 19) was intended to tread; any interest I may have felt in the work of my hands is utterly effaced. Of course, such sad experiences as these breed a certain amount of charity towards others, and the other day I encountered a severe criticism of a valued contributor to the Journal, based on nothing more than a manifest typographical error. In an article on Naevius by Professor MARX (Verhandlungen der

Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften, Phil. hist. Klasse 63. 1911. 3. Heft. S. 70) the author, not inclined to mercy by Professor KNAPP's strictures on his Lucilius, says: In einer Abhandlung der A. J. P. XXIX 1908 erweist CH. KNAPP seine Belähigung in diesen Sachen mitzusprechen dadurch dass er die *cohors praetoria*, die Appian mit φίλων ἄη bezeichnet S. 473 mit ὕλη φίλων wiedergiebt. Now everyone knows that there are no more common slips of the type than an exchange of breathings, an exchange of ι and υ, and as ὕλη φίλων makes no sense whatever, the proof-reader though overtaken in a fault is not in the same condemnation as those who allowed *porci Penelopes* to pass for *proci Penelopes* (A. J. P. I 515). A most unfortunate oversight, I grant. Still, in view of the ado that has been made about it, I am tempted to reverse the order of St. James 3, 5 and say, ἡλικὸν πῦρ ἡλικῇ ὕλη ἀνάπτει.

D. M. R.: All classical teachers should be interested in the colored lithograph of Priene, about three feet by three feet and three inches, which has recently been issued (*Priene, Nach den Ergebnissen der Ausgrabungen der Kgl. Preuss. Museen 1895-1898 rekonstruiert von A. Zippelius. Aquarelliert von E. Wolfsfeld, Teubner 1910, 7 M.*). Priene was an Ionic city built in the time of Alexander, who dedicated its temple to Athena. There was an earlier Priene, but no trace of it remains. The Alexandrian Priene had an admirable situation, high above the valley of the Maeander, on a bold and precipitous rock. It was completely excavated in 1895-8 by the Germans, and is the best extant example of a fortified Hellenistic city. It may be called the Greek Pompeii because all the parts of a Greek city from the temple to the private house have been found here. In this lithograph you see the Acropolis, the walls, and the marketplace surrounded by colonnades with a temple of Asclepius nearby. Behind is the senate house or Ecclesiasterion, and still higher up is the theatre with its well-preserved proscenium, and to the left the temple of Athena. Below is the stadium and the gymnasium where one can still read the names of the gymnasts who had the jack-knife habit twenty-one hundred years or more ago. The chief interest perhaps is in the many private houses, dating from the fourth, third, and second centuries B. C. They all have about the same plan. There is a single open court round which the rooms are grouped. The main room has a portico or *prostas*. The plan is substantially that of the Mycenaean palace. In the second century B. C., however, comes in the peristyle, which did not exist in the Greek house of the Classical Age, and which first occurs in houses excavated on the island of Delos. The streets run at right angles to one another in the Hippodamean manner, contrasting with the older system of

crooked streets, which still exists in many oriental towns. All these and other features are clearly reproduced in this reconstruction, which has been colored to correspond to the modern landscape. It gives a bird's-eye view of Priene as it looked in the second century B. C., and is the first accurate picture of an ancient Greek city. One is struck by the few windows the houses have. The Greek houses, like Renaissance palaces, had practically no windows. Their home life centred not on the street but on the court, which was also the source of light. To the ancient citizen the view which our windows give to the public would have been as objectionable as to the modern oriental, and in many ways this instructive reconstruction resembles such modern Greek towns as Lindos on Rhodes. The colors, perhaps, are not perfect and a little blurred, but on the whole the lithograph is a valuable piece of work and is to be recommended to all classical schools and colleges and to those interested in city-planning. The text accompanying the plate is reprinted from the *Neue Jahrbücher* XXV, and is a very convenient summary of the larger and more detailed book on Priene by Wiegand and Schrader. There are eighteen good illustrations and three plates, slides of which may be procured from Dr. Stödtner in Berlin. This essay is in Director Wiegand's own clear and attractive style, but should be made accessible in an English translation. The important excavations at Priene, Miletus, and Didyma have made Director Wiegand one of the world's foremost archaeologists, and we wish him all success in his digging on Samos, for which he has received a ten years' firman and about which we already have the first report with a new and unique plan of the Heraeum (*Erster vorläufiger Bericht über die von den königlichen Museen unternommenen Ausgrabungen in Samos, Berlin, Reimer, 1911*).

C. W. P.: The meaning of adjectives in -ικός and their synonyms and antonyms are the chief topics discussed by Professor G. K. Gardikas of the University of Athens in his *Πραγματεία περὶ τῶν εἰς -ικός ληγόντων ἐπιθέτων* (Athens, 1910), reprinted from *Ἀθηνᾶ* XXII 426-471. Particularly interesting are the passages cited from classical authors, chiefly Aristotle, in order to give the ancients' interpretation of words ending in the suffix, e. g. ἀκολουθητικοὶ = οἳ οἱ ἀκολουθεῖν. Much space is given to synonymous words derived from the same stem as the adj. in -ικός but with different suffixes (-ιος, -ιμος, -εις, -ωδης, -ηλος, -ηρος), or with a prefix (ἐν-, ἐπι-, προσ-, εὐ-, φιλο-, ὀξύ-). Between all so-called synonyms there are differences of meaning, greater or less, and this fact makes criticism difficult; but when in the same paragraph G. maintains that ξένιος and ξενικός are synonyms, and that πάτριος and πατρικός differ πάμπόλυ from each other, one is bound to

note that, since *πάτριος* and *πατρικός* interchange meanings more frequently than the other pair, this is fair evidence that they are nearer to each other in meaning than *ξένιος* and *ξενικός* are. Furthermore, *κτηματικός* = *φιλοκτήμων* and *ἀρχικός* = *φίλαρχος* show the wide divergence of meaning in some of G.'s synonyms. Clearchus was *ἀρχικός*, Menon *φίλαρχος*.

G. is in all probability wrong in treating *-ικός* as a primary suffix; his examples *γραφικός*, *βαφικός*, and *ἀρχικός* may as well come from *γραφή*, *βαφή*, and *ἀρχή*, and *πειθαρχικός* is not from *πειθαρχῶ* at all, but from *πείθαρχος*. He rightly attacks Budenz's view that adjj. in *-τικός* are derived from verbal nouns in *-σις* (= *-τις*), but he fails to notice that back of the nomina agentis in *-της* from which he himself derives them stand the verbal adjectives in *-τος*, *-της* and *-τος* being two forms of the same suffix (Brugmann). It is more common to say that forms in *-τικός* come from the verbal adjective. One may note also that the origin of the suffix *-ιακός* about which he speaks with confidence is still an unsettled problem among scholars.

In the course of his article G. forms by analogy about 100 new adjj. in *-ικός*. *δοξολογικός* and *όπλομαχικός* whose existence he denies seem to be fairly well attested in the literature; cf. *ναυμαχικός* and his own creations in *-λογικός* on p. 24. He speaks of an adj. suffix *-τήριος*, and expresses surprise that there is "no mention of this suffix in Kühner-Blass". Cf. K.-B. II, p. 292. Typographical errors abound, and there are several repetitions and misplaced footnotes.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Barss (J. E.) Third year Latin for sight reading. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1911. 128 pp. 12°, 40 c.

Bibliotheca abessinica. Ed. by Enno Littmann. gr. 8°. Leiden, *E. J. Brill*. Vol. IV. Octateuch, The, in Ethiopic. According to the text of the Paris codex, with the variants of five other manuscripts, ed. by J. Ose. Boyd. Part II. Exodus and Leviticus. (vii, 240 S.) 1911. nn 11.

Cicero. An easy selection from Cicero's correspondence; ed. by J. D. Duff. New York, *Putnam*, 1911. 6 + 126 pp. 16° (Pitt Press ser.), 45 c. net.

Coleridge (S. T.) Biographia epistolaris; ed. by A. Turnbull. In 3 v. New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 24 + 300; 8 + 351 pp. Bibl. 12° (Bohn lib.), ea., \$1 net.

Daniels (E. D.) A sight book in Latin. Boston, *Sandborn*, 1911. 18 + 118 pp. 12°, 50 c.

Ferguson (W. S.) Hellenistic Athens. London, 1911. 504 pp. 8°, 12s. net.

Homer. The Odyssey; tr. into English verse by Alex. Pope; ed., with introd. and notes by Edg. S. Shumway and Waldo Shumway. New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 39 + 478 pp. Por. 12°, 25 c.

— The Iliad of Homer; tr. into English blank verse, by A. G. Lewis. New York, *Baker & T.*, 1911. 12°, \$1.75 net.

Iamblichos. Theurgia; or, the Egyptian mysteries; tr. from the Greek by Alex. Wilder. New York, *Metaphysical Publication*, 500 Fifth Ave, 1911. 288 pp. 8°, \$2.50.

Mierow (C. C.) The essentials of Greek syntax. Boston, *Ginn*, 1911. 7 + 165 pp. 12°, \$1.25.

New (The) American encyclopedic dictionary of the English language. 5 v. Chicago, *Riverside Publication*, 1911. Il. pls. (partly col., partly double). Fold. maps. 4°, \$25.

Northrup (Clark S.) The present bibliographical status of modern philology; published for the Bibliographical Society of America. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1911. 48 pp. 8°, pap., 50 c. net.

Plato. Plato's Phaedo; ed., with introd. and notes, by J. Burnet. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1911. 12°, \$1.25.

Ritchie (F.) First steps in Latin, and Second steps in Latin; ed. by F. C. Staples. New York, *Longmans*, 1911. 8 + 164 pp. 12°, \$1.25.

Rolfe (J.) Carew and Dennison (Wa.) A junior Latin book. Rev. ed. Boston, *Allyn & B.*, 1911. 6 + 397 + 149 pp. Maps (partly fold.), 12°, \$1.25.

Rolleston (T. W.) Myths and Legends of the Celtic Race. London, 1911. 458 pp. 8°, 7s. 6d. net.

Thomas (C.), and Swanton (J. R.) Indian Languages of Mexico and Central America and their geographical Distribution. London, 1911. 108 pp. 8°, 4s. 6d. net.

GERMAN.

Aeschini Socratici reliquiae. Ed. et commentario instruxit Heinr. Krausa. (x, 124 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1911. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.80.

Appelmann (A.) *Der fünffüssige Jambus bei Otto Ludwig*, Kritik. (229 S. m. 4 Taf.) gr. 8°. Münster, *A. Greve*, 1911. m. 5.60.

Aurelli Victoris, Sexti, liber de Caesaribus. Praecedunt: Origo gentis romanae et liber de viris illustribus urbis Romae. Subsequitur: Epitome de Caesaribus. Recensuit Francisc. Pichlmayr. (xxii, 210 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1911. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 4. geb. in Leinw. 4.40.

Beckh (Herm.) *Udānavarga.* Eine Sammlg. buddhist. Sprüche in tibet. Sprache. (vii, 159 S.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *G. Reimer*, 1911. m. 6.

Eranos. *Acta philologica suecana.* Edenda curavit Vilelm. Lundström. Vol. XI. 4 fasc. 1911. (Fasc. 1 u. 2. 106 S.) gr. 8°. Göteborg. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*. m. 8.

Gemoll (Mart.) *Die Indogermanen im alten Orient.* Mythologisch-historische Funde u. Fragen. (viii, 124 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *J. O. Harichs' Verl.*, 1911. m. 3.60.

Hellingrath (Norb. v.) *Pindarübertragungen v. Hölderlin.* (vii, 83 S.) 8°. Jena, *E. Diederichs*, 1911. m. 1.50.

Kukula (R. C.) *Römische Säkularpoesie.* (iii, 97 S.) 8°. Leipzig. *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. m. 3.

Leenwen (van). *Commentationes Homericae.* (vii, 236 S.) gr. 8°. Lugduni Batavorum, 1911. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff*. m. 6.

Leonhard (Walth.) *Hetiter u. Amazonen.* (x, 252 S. m. 1 Karte.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. m. 8.

Möller (Herm.) *Vergleichendes indogermanisch-semitisches Wörterbuch.* (xxxvi, 316 S.) gr. 8°. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*, 1911. m. 12.

Musinowicz (Alex.) *Die Stellung des attributiven Adjektivs im Altisländischen u. Altnorwegischen.* (Diss.) (xii, 130 S.) gr. 8°. Riga, *N. Kymmell*, 1911. m. 5.

Paulson (Johs.) *Index Lucretianus (ut manu scriptus prelo datus).* (vi, 179 S.) gr. 8°. Göttingen, *Wettergren & Kerber*, 1911. m. 7.

Pertsch (Ericus). *De Valerio Martiale graecorum poetarum imitatore.* (Diss.) (68 S.) gr. 8°. Berolini, 1911. Berlin, *K. Trenkel*. m. 2.

Peter (Herm.) *Wahrheit u. Kunst, Geschichtschreibung u. Plagiat im klassischen Altertum.* (xii, 490 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. m. 12.

Phrynichi Sophistae praeparatio sophistica, ed. Ioa. de Borries. (xvi, 199 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1911. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 4.

Prinz (Karl). *Martial u. die griechische Epigrammatik.* 1. Tl. (88 S.) gr. 8°. Wien, *A. Hölder*, 1911. m. 2.

Rerum aethiopicarum scriptores occidentales inediti a saeculo XVI ad XIX, curante C. Beccari, S. I. Lex. 8°. Romae. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*. jedes Vol. m. 20. Subskr.-Pr. m. 16.

Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- u. Kulturwissenschaft. Hrg. v. Karl Brugmann u. Alb. Thumb. gr. 8°. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*. II. Kieckers (Ernst). *Die Stellung des Verbs im Griechischen u. in den verwandten Sprachen.* 1. Tl. Die Stellg. des Verbs im einfachen Hauptsatze u. im Nachsatze nach den griech. Inschriften u. der älteren griech. Prosa, verglichen m. den verwandten Sprachen. (xi, 156 S.) m. 6.

Vosen (Chr. Herm.) et Kaulen (Fr.) *Rudimenta linguae hebraicae.* Nona ed. quam recognovit et auxit Jac. Schumacher. (xi, 171 S.) gr. 8°. Freiburg i/B., *Herder*, 1911. m. 2.

ITALIAN.

Castiglioni (A.) *Collectanea graeca*. Pisa, 1911. 8°. 808 pp. L. 12.

Mingarelli (Alessandro). *Aulo Persio Flacco (la vita et le opere)*. Bologna, 16°, p. 127. L. 2.

Pascal (C.) *Dioniso. Saggio sulla parodia e sulla critica religiosa in Aristofane*. Catania, 1911. 8°. 310 pp. L. 5.

Trombetti (A.) *Sulla origine delle consonanti enfatiche nel semitico*. Bologna, 1911. 4°. 50 pp. L. 5.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Bibliotheca Abessinica, edited by E. Littmann. IV: The Octateuch in Ethiopic, edited by J. Oskar Boyd. Part II: Exodus and Leviticus. Leyden, *E. J. Brill*. Princeton, *The University Library*, 1911. 11 m.

Blackburn (E. M.) *A Study of Words*. London and New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1911.

Christ (Wilhelm von). *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, unter Mitwirkung von Otto Stählin, bearb. von Wilhelm Schmid (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausg. von I. von Müller. Siebenter Band. 1. Teil). München, *Oskar Beck*, 1912. 18 m. 50.

Classical Review. Vol. XXV, No. 7, November, 1911. London, *John Murray*.

Commentationes Aenipontanae quas edidit E. Kalinka. VI: J. Soukuf: De Libello Simonis de re equestri. *Ad Aeni Pontem in Aedibus Wagnerianis*, MDCCCXI.

De Boer (W.) In Galeni Pergameni Libros *περὶ ψυχῆς παθῶν καὶ ἀμαρτημάτων* Observationes Criticae. Diss. Inaug., *Marpurgi Cattorum*, MCMXI.

Deckinger (Hermann). Die Darstellung der persönlichen Motive bei Aischylos und Sophokles. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Buchhandlung*, 1912. 4 m. 50.

Eastern and Western Review. October, 1911. *I. I. Timayenis*, Boston, Mass., 10 c.

Fay (E. W.) *Language Study and Language Psychology*. Reprint from *Popular Science Monthly*. October, 1911.

Foster (B. O.) *Propertiana*, Reprinted from Matzke Memorial Volume. Leland Stanford Jr. University Publications, *Stanford University*, 1911.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XXII, 1911. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Haupt (Paul). An Ancient Protest against the Curse of Eve. Reprinted from *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. I, No. 201. September, 1911.

Heidel (William Arthur). *Antecedents of Greek Corpuscular Theories*. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. XXII, 1911.

Hertig (Gustavus). Die etruskische Leinwandrolle des National-Museums. *Abhandlungen der Königl. Bayer. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, XXV. Band, 4 Abth. München, 1911.

Hermes, Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. v. Friedrich Leo u. Carl Robert. XLVI. Band, 4. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1911.

Hoey (G. W.) An Irish Homily on the Passion. Text and Translation. *Catholic University Bulletin*, Vol. XVII, Nos. 5-6, 1911.

Hoskier (H. C.) Concerning the Date of the Boharic Version. London, *Bernhard Quaritch*, 1911.

Kellogg (George D.) On Plautus' *Mostellaria*, 832 ff. *Proceedings of the American Philological Association*. Vol. XLI, 1911.

Lexicon Plautinum. Conscripsit Gonzalez Lodge. Vol. I, Fasc. VI: EGO-FABVLA. Lipsiae, *In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri*, MCMXI.

Marck (Siegfried). Die Platonische Ideenlehre in ihren Motiven. München, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1912. 4 m.

Μελέτη ('Η). *Μηνιαῖον δημοσίευμα*. Τεύχος 7ον. Αύγ.-Σεπτ., 1911. ἐν Ἀθήναις. 1 δρ.

Mierow (C. C.) *The Essentials of Greek Syntax*. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1911. \$1.25.

Minor (Albert). *De Galeni Libris περὶ δυσπνοίας*. Diss. Inaug., *Marpurgi Cattorum*, MCMXI.

Murray (A. T.) *Aratus and Theocritus*. Reprinted from *Matske Memorial Volume*. Leland Stanford Jr. University Publications, *Stanford University*, October, 1911.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. Paul Caer. Vierzehnter Jahrg. XXVII. u. XXVIII. Bandes 8. u. 9. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Nr. 5/6. Helsingfors, 1911.

Nicolai de prellis et occasu ducis Burgundiae. Ein Facsimile-Buch mit deutscher Uebersetzung, Erklärung u. 8 illustrativen Beilagen. Herausgegeben v. R. Luginbuehl. Basel, *Birkhaeuser*, 1911.

Nutting (H. C.) *A Latin Primer*. New York, *American Book Company*, 1911.

Oliphant (S. G.) *Fragments of a Lost Myth*. Reprinted from *Proceedings of the American Philological Association*. Vol. XLI, 1911.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). Ed. by Sir James A. H. Murray. SIMPLE—SLEEP (Vol. IX) by W. A. Craigie. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*. \$1.25.

Peck (Harry Thurston). *A History of Classical Philology*. New York, *The Macmillan Company*, 1911. \$2.

Πρακτικὰ τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τοῦ ἔτους 1910. Ἀθήνησιν, 1910.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias, Universidad de la Habana. Julio de 1911. Vol. XIII, Num. 1.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von A. Brinkmann. N. F., LXVI 4. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerländer's Verlag*, 1911.

Shaw (J. E.) *The Sonnet of Guido Cavalcanti, Amore e Monna Lagia*. Reprinted from *Studies in Honour of A. Marshall Elliott*, Vol. II.

Shewan (Alexander). *Homeric Games at an ancient St. Andrews*. Edinburgh, *James Thin*, 1911. 5s.

Sichardus (Johannes) u. die von ihm benutzten Bibliotheken u. Handschriften. Von Paul Lehmann (Quellen u. Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, begründet von Ludwig Traube, IV. 1). München, *Oskar Beck*, 1912. 10 m.

Travels and Studies in the Nearer East by A. T. Olmstead, B. B. Charles, J. E. Wrench. Vol. I, part II: Hittite Inscriptions. Ithaca, New York, 1911.

Trösch (Ernest). *Die helvetische Revolution im Lichte der deutsch-schweizerischen Dichtung*. Leipzig, *H. Haessel*, 1911. 4 m. 60.

Tuttle (Edwin H.) *Turanic and Dravidian*. New Haven, Conn., 1911.

Webb (Robert Henning). *An Attempt to restore the γ Archetype of Terence MSS.* *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. XXII, 1911.

Wensinck (A. J.) *Legends of Eastern Saints, Chiefly from Syriac Sources*. Vol. I. *The Story of Archelides*. Leyden, *E. J. Brill*. 6 m. 50.

Zimmern (Alfred E.) *The Greek Commonwealth: Politics and Economics in Fifth Century Athens*. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1911. 8s. 6d.

INDEX TO VOL. XXXII.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------|
| Accius, Callimachus and, | 469 | Bender, Harold H. Suffixes | |
| Achilles Tatius and Musaeus, | 472 | - <i>mant</i> and - <i>vant</i> in Sanskrit | |
| Acta imperatorum Romanorum, | 106 | and Avestan (rev.), | 91-98 |
| Agrippa's Map of the World, | 106 | Bennett's Syntax of Early Latin | |
| Alexandria, Tribes in, | 350 | (rev.), | 333-343 |
| Ammianus, Clark's (rev.), | 344-347 | BLAKE, FRANK B. Tagalog | |
| Anacreon, 90 B, | 351 | Verbs derived from other | |
| Anonymus Argentinensis, | 465 | parts of Speech, | 436-440 |
| Antigone of Sophocles, Compo- | | BLOOMFIELD, LEONARD. Indo- | |
| sition of, | 467 | European Palatals in San- | |
| Antiochus, Hannibal and, | 467 | skrit, | 36-50 |
| Apollo Pythoktonos, | 472 | Boat Song, Oxyrhynchus, | 108 |
| Arcadian <i>συνοικία</i> -treaty, | 340 | Bobliensia, | 104, 348, 349, 350 |
| Archiv für lateinische Lexiko- | | Books Received, 127-130; 242- | |
| graphie u. Grammatik, Re- | | 250; 372-376; 478-489 | |
| port of, | 98-103; 221-227 | Botany, Greek, | 473 |
| Ariston, Founder of Stoic | | Brief Mention, 111-121; 230- | |
| Grammar, | 476 | 242; 358-367; 478-489 | |
| Aristophanes, Acharnians 490- | | BROWNE, W. H. On Browning | |
| 498, | 349 | and Tennyson, | 484-5 |
| Av. 41, | 464 | Browning's Lapses, real and | |
| 1248, | 484 | imaginary, | 241; 482-5 |
| Cantica, Structure of, | 351 | Buchanan's New Edition of the | |
| Georgoi, Date of, | 421-430 | Codex Veronensis (b), | 220-221 |
| Hermes in, | 107 | Buddha as Tathāgata, | 205-209 |
| Irreligion of, | 238 | Burgundian Dialect, | 356 |
| Nub. 967, | 474 | Burnam's Palaeographia Latina | |
| Plut. 267, | 476 | (mentioned), | 242 |
| Ran. 972, | 472 | Bury's Symposium (mentioned), | 233 |
| Aristotle on the Art of Poetry, | | Butcher, Death of, | 122 |
| Bywater's (rev.), | 85-91 | Bywater's Aristotle on the Art | |
| Met. A 1, 981a 12 and A 9, | | of Poetry (rev.), | 85-91 |
| 992b 7 and the Pre-Soc- | | Byzantine Greek Prose, Hiatus | |
| ratists, | 107 | in the Accentual Clausulae | |
| Two Books <i>περὶ ποιητικῆς</i> | | of, | 188-204 |
| <i>τέχνης</i> , | 473 | History, | 118 |
| Asia Minor, Folkspeech in, | 466 | Caesar's Writings, | 476 |
| Asokan Miscellany, | 441-448 | Cadmus of Cos, | 106 |
| Astrology in Greek Liturgy, | 111 | Callimachus and Accius, | 469 |
| Athena-hymns, Ancient, | 474 | Conjectures on, | 348-349 |
| Athens <i>αἱ ἱστέφανοι</i> , | 367 | Carm. Epigr. Lat., | 100 |
| Attic Decrees, | 111 | CAPPS, EDWARD, The Date of | |
| Authorized Version, | 483 | Aristophanes' Georgoi, | 421-430 |
| Avestan, Suffixes - <i>mant</i> and | | Four Plays of Menander (men- | |
| - <i>vant</i> in, | 91-93 | tioned), | 362 |
| Barbagallo, Lo Stato e l'istru- | | Carians and Leleges, | 108 |
| zione pubblica nell' Impero | | | |
| Romano (rev.), | 458-460 | | |

- CARROLL MITCHELL.** Review of
Bywater's Aristotle on the
Art of Poetry, 85-91
Cassius Felix, 110
Catullus 66, 59; 116, 1, 474
Cicero, de Divinatione, 110
Somn. Scip. 17, 472
Scholia Boblensia, 104, 348, 349, 350
CIG 2438, 464
CIL Vol. vi, Syntactical Peculiarities in, 222
Clark's Ammianus (rev.), 344-347
Claudius Quadrigarius, Language of, 98
Clausulae, Accentual, of Byzantine Greek Prose, Hiatus in, 188-204
Comedy Papyri of Ghorân, 461
Comedy, Technique of, 350
Crates in the Scholion Genevense, 462
Curtius Quintus, Epoch of, 227

Daemon, The Scourged 477
Dactylic Hexameter, the Endings *-ere* and *-erunt* in, 328-332
Δελφικὰ γράμματα, 105
Democritus fr. 3 Diels, emended, 111
Dwight Henry B. Hiatus in the Accentual Clausulae of Byzantine Greek Prose, 188-204
Dwitt, N. W. Review of Birt's *Jugendverse u. Heimatpoesie Vergils*, 448-458
Dictators, Years of, 477
Didaskalika, 349
Dio of Prusa, Text and Style, 463
Diogenes Laertius 3, 28, emended, 107
Diogenes of Oinoanda, 350
Donatus and his Interpretationes Vergilianae, 102
Erchanbert's Commentary on, 107
Latinity of, 226

EBELING, HERMAN L. Report of Hermes, 461-468
EDGERTON, FRANKLIN. Review of Petersen's Greek Diminutives in *-ιον*, and Bender's Suffixes *-mant* and *-vant* in Sanskrit and Avestan, 91-98
Note on Holbrooke's Aryan Word-Building, 114
Ellis's World of Dreams (mentioned), 478
Ennius, Vahlen's, 1-35
Ἐφέσια γράμματα, 105
Epicurean polemic against mythological tradition, 105
Erchanbert's Commentary on Donatus, 107
Etruscan 'Ci' and 'utofer', 352
Euripides, Tro. 1831, 109
Eusebius' Onomasticon, 350
Eustathius, Theophrastus and, 474

Farinelli, Dante e la Francia (rev.), 215-218
FAY, EDWIN W. Derivatives of the Root *dhē(y)* 403-420
Firmicus Maternus, Math. I 5; II 10, 472
Folklanguages in Asia Minor, 466, 472
French of the Jews, 354

Gardikas' Adjectives in *-ικός* (mentioned), 488-9
Gargilius Martialis, Palladius and, 461
Gayley's Classic Myths (mentioned), 240
Ghorân, Comedy papyri of, 461
GILDERSLEEVE, BASIL L. Review of Ridgeway, The Origin of Tragedy, 210-215
See also *Brief Mention*.
Goethe's Urworte, Orphisch, 468
Golden Latin Gospels, 219-229
Greek: ΓΑΣ = *γενόμενος ἀπελευθερος*, 476; *γαῖτανός* = a cord, 477; *εὐχαριστία* and *εὐχαριστεῖν*, 475; *Κέλμις ἐν σιδήρῳ*, 227; *ὑμνημέναια*, 476.
Greek Botany:
Adjectives in *-ικός*, 488-9
Diminutives in *-ιον*, 93-97
K and Π forms in the Early Ionic Poets, 74-84
Love Incantations, 469
Palaeography, Villolsen's, 227
Plural = Singular, 234
Spiritus asper and lenis in Hebrew Words, 109
Theatre, Parodoi in the, 377-403
Grillparzer on the Antique Stage, 471
Grundy's Thucydides (mentioned), 482
Gudeman's Imagines Philologorum (mentioned), 240

HAMILTON, GEORGE L. Review of Farinelli, Dante e la Francia, 215-218
Hannibal and Antiochus, 467

- Hebrew Words, Spiritus asper
 and lenis in, 109
 Hercules at the Crossroads, 109
 Hermes, Report of, 461-468
 Hermes Trismegistus, 228
 Hesiod's Five Ages, 365
 Works and Days, Horatian
 Urbanity in, 181-165
 Hexameter, Dactylic, Endings
 -ere and -erunt in, 328-332
 Hiatus in the Accentual Claus-
 ulae of Byzantine Greek
 Prose, 187-204
 Hierocles, the Neo-Platonist, 349
 Hilary of Poitiers and Sallust, 477
 Hippocrates, De Morbis, 351
 Historical Novels, 358-360
 Holbrooke's Aryan Word-Build-
 ing, 114
 Homer, Repeated Verses in, 313-321
 HOPKINS, E. WASHBURN. Bud-
 dha as Tathāgata, 205-209
 Horace, 2, 7, 10; 2, 18, 26, 110
 Od. I 2 (cf. Archil. fr. 74);
 II 17, 471
 Od. III 6, 10; 14, 19; 24, 4;
 29, 24, 98
 Sat. I 4, 35, 468
 Horatian Urbanity in Hesiod's
 Works and Days, 181-165
 Hoskier's Golden Latin Gospels
 (rev.), 218-220
 HOSKIER, H. C. Review of
 Buchanan's New Edition of
 the Codex Veronensis (b),
 220-221
 House-door in Greek and Roman
 Religion and Folklore, 257-271
 HUDSON-WILLIAMS, T. K and II
 Forms in the Early Ionic
 Poets, 74-84
 Hymns, Ancient Greek Hymns
 in Aristophanes' Clouds, 474
 Iamblichus, Anonymus, 110
 Indo-European Palatals in San-
 skrit, 36-57
 Inscription, Greek from Ash-
 mounin, 228
 Inscriptions, Latin, at the Johns
 Hopkins University, 165-187
 Ionic Poets, Early, K and II
 forms in the, 74-84
 Jacobs, Miscellanea Critica, 465
 Jewish French, 354
 Jones' Poetical Plural (men-
 tioned), 284
 Juvenal, Notes on, 322-327
 K and II Forms in the Early
 Ionic Poets, 74-84
 KNIDEL, GEORGE C. Report of
 Romania, 352-357
 KILLOGG, GEORGE DWIGHT.
 Report of Philologus,
 108-111; 468-477
 KENT, ROLAND G. Lucilius on
 Ei and *I*, 272-293
 KNAPP, CHARLES. Review of
 Bennett's Syntax of Early
 Latin, 338-343
 Kuba-Kybele, 104-105
 Lascaris, Death of, 1584, 350
 Latin :
 Actutum, 103; aequore, 98;
 armatus, 225; chirurgus, a,
 100; conustus, 226; con-
 tumelia, 224; crepatura,
 226; ct, assimilation of,
 224; cumque=quandocum-
 que, 226; de- and dis-, 100;
 deformare, 100; donec, 228;
 ei and i, 272-293; eluare,
 222; etquis, 99; evalere,
 226; fatidicus, 99; fefelli-
 tus sum, 100; fraumentum,
 101; glando=glans, 225;
 hoccine, 99; idus, 102;
 inauspiciatus, 98; incessare,
 225; interest, 99; involare,
 446-7; invenis, 98; kalen-
 dae, 102; lacernobirrus,
 226; lares, 100; lepturgus,
 100; malus vel pravus, 102;
 manere=esse, 223, 225;
 maniae, 190; Mytilius not
 Mytilus, 224; obrio and
 obro, 225; persona, 101;
 pontifex, 102; proinde and
 perinde, 225; pullus=gal-
 lus, 102; que-que, 101;
 quinquevir, 224; quo (dat.),
 99; redire, reverti, reducem
 esse, 224; refert, 99; senex,
 98; simpuvium-simpulum,
 101; st=est, 229; suppli-
 cium, 100; ultuisse, 228;
 uter, utris, 226; vagax, 98;
 vetulam=vitulam, 111;
 vomi=vomui, 225.
 Latin, Accusativus c. inf., 241
 Classicisms and Archaisms, 228
 Dactylic Poetry gives rise to
 New Forms, 102
 Double Forms in, 101
 Gerundive Constructions, 222
 Historical Infinitive, 103

- Imperial 'Kanzleistil', 99
 Inscriptions at the Johns Hopkins University, 116-187
 Mercuriales viri, 471
 Orthography, 100
 Perfect in *-ere* and *-erunt*, 338
 Pronunciation of C, 101
 Shall-subjunctive, 479
 Stem Formations in, 222
 Syntax, 98
 Syntax of Early Latin, 338-343
 Latinity of Donatus, 226
 Vitruvius, 227
 Lares semitales, 351
 Legrand's Daos (mentioned), 362
 Libelli in the Imperial Time, 476
 Liturgy, Greek, Astrology in, 111
 Livy's Literary Method, 349
 Lokroi Epigraphyrioi, Finds in, 470
 Love Incantation, Greek, 469
 Lucian, Gallus § 24, 471
 Icaromenippus § 18, 471
 Podagra, 8, 351
 Lucilius on *Ei* and *I*, 272-293
 Lucretius, Lib. I, Doublet in, 467
 and Music, 110
 Lycophron, Scaliger's translation of, 111
 Lysias, Jacobs' Critical Notes on, 466
- MAGOFFIN, R. V. D. Review of Barbagallo's *Lo Stato e l'istruzione pubblica nell'Impero Romano*, 458-460
 Manilius' poem dedicated to Tiberius Caesar, 349
 Maniples, Roman, Quincunx formation of, 474
 Martial, 3, 58, 12, 106
 Contributions to the Criticism and Exegesis of, 104
 Marx on Knapp, 486
 Masks on the Roman Stage, 58-73
 Materfamilias, Nomenclature of, 352
 Menander, Article in, 349
 Chorus in, 464, 467
 Epitrepontes, 468
 Fragments of, 363
 Perikeiromene, 468
 Metelli and Naevius, 366
 Meyer on Hesiod's Five Ages, 365
 MICHELSON, TRUMAN. Asokan Miscellany, 441-443
 MILLER, C. W. E. Report of *Revue de Philologie*, 227-229
 Minos, 349
 Morgan, M. H., and his mystification, 118
- Moschus, Eur. 60, 464
 MUSTARD, WILFRED, P. Report of *Rheinisches Museum*, 348-352
 Notice of Kerlin's *Theocritus in English Literature*, 120-121
 Mustard's Mantuanus (mentioned), 481
 MYRICK, ARTHUR B. A note on the Etymology of *Involare*, 446-447
- Naevius and the Metelli 366
 Necrology, Butcher, Samuel Henry, 123
 Nemesius *περί φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*, 468
 New Year's Day in the Roman Empire, 109
 NORLIN, GEORGE. The Conventions of the Pastoral Elegy, 294-312
 Novilara, Inscription of, 461
- Odyssey 12, 101, 477
 OGLE, M. B. The House-door in Greek and Roman Religion and Folklore, 247-271
 Orpheus, Argon. 1072, 474
 Oxyrhynchus Boat Song, 108
 Historian and Xenophon, 466
 Palladius and Gargilius Martialis, 461
 Parodoi in the Greek Theatre, 377-402
 Pascal's Dioniso (mentioned), 237
 Pastoral Elegy, The Conventions of the, 294-312
 Paul, St., Gal. 4, 3, 18; Col. 2, 8, 20, 475
 Pearson's *Phoenissae* (mentioned), 361-362
 PEPPER, C. W. Mention of *Gardikas' -ικός*, 488-9
 Peregrinatio Silvæ, Author of, 102
 Perrot's Henri Weil (mentioned), 118
 Petersen's Greek Diminutives in *-ιον*, 93-97
 Pindar's *ἰοστέφανου Ἀθῆναι*, 367
 Quotableness, 480-2
 Pisatis, 366
 Philo, MSS of, 464
 Philologus, Report of, 103-111; 468-477
 Plato, Basic Political Views of, 106
 Ep. XIII, 106
 Eryximachus in, 114
 Meno, 91 C, 351
 Portrait Bust of, 107

- Symposium (204 C-212 A) Di-
 otima in 103-104
 Various Passages in, 230 foll.
 Trilogy, Timalos, Kritias,
 Hermokrates, 468
 Plautus, Captivi, 351
 Pliny, Ep. I 16, 1, Legal For-
 mula in, 108
 Pliny, N. H, 2, 202, 468
 Pre-Socratics, Aristotle and the, 107
 Priapea, emended, 476
 Priscian and Flavius Caper, 108
 Prodicus misquoted, 118
 PROKOSCH, E. A Slavic Anal-
 ogy to Verner's Law, 431-435
 Publilius Syrus, 226
 Punic War, The First, 108

 Quincunx Formation of Roman
 Maniples, 106, 474
 Quintilian, his Major Declama-
 tions, 468

 RAND, E. K. Horatian Urbanity
 in Hesiod's Works and
 Days, 131-165
 Recent Publications, 123-126;
 243-246; 368-371; 490-2
 REES, KELLEY. The Signifi-
 cance of the Parodoi in
 the Greek Theatre, 377-402
 Reports:
 Archiv für lateinische Lexi-
 kographie u. Grammatik,
 98-103; 222-227
 Hermes, 461-468
 Philologus, 103-111; 468-477
 Revue de Philologie, 227-229
 Rheinisches Museum, 348-352
 Romania, 352-357
 Reviews:
 Barbagallo's Lo Stato e l'istru-
 zione pubblica nell' Im-
 pero Romano, 458-460
 Bender, Suffixes *-mant* and
-vant in Sanskrit and Aves-
 tan, 91-93
 Bennett's Syntax of Early
 Latin, 333-343
 Birt's Jugendverse u. Heimat-
 poesie Vergils, 448-458
 Buchanan's New Edition of
 the Codex Veronensis (b),
 220-221
 Burnam's Palaeographia La-
 tina, 242
 Bury's Symposium, 232
 Bywater's Aristotle on the
 Art of Poetry, 85-91

 Clark's Ammianus, 344-347
 Ellis's World of Dreams, 478
 Farinelli, Dante e la Francia,
 215-218
 Gardikas, Adjectives in *-akós*,
 488-9
 Gayley's Classic Myths in
 English Literature, 240
 Gudeman's Imagines Philolo-
 gorum, 240
 Holbrooke's Aryan World-
 Building, 114
 Hoskier, The Golden Latin
 Gospels, 219-220
 Jones, Poetical Plural of
 Greek, 234
 Kerlin's Theocritus in Eng-
 lish Literature, 121
 Pascal's Dioniso, 238
 Ridgeway's Origin of Trag-
 edy, 210-215
 Shewan, The Lay of Dolon, 236
 Schöne's Hug's Symposium,
 230-233
 Sonnenschein's Latin Subjuc-
 tive, 479
 Steele, Conditional Sentences
 in Livy, 367
 Witte, Singular u. Plural, 234-236
 Wright's Studies in Men-
 ander, 363-365
 Revue de Philologie, Report of,
 227-229
 Rex, aeternae domine, Metre of, 105
 Rheinisches Museum, Report
 of, 348-352
 Ridgeway, William. The Origin
 of Tragedy (rev.), 210-215
 ROBINSON, D. M. Mention of
 Zippelius' Priene, 487
 ROLFE, JOHN C. Report of
 Archiv für lateinische Lexi-
 kographie u. Grammatik,
 98-103; 222-227
 Roman Empire, New Year's
 Day in, 109
 Public Instruction in, 408-460
 Stage, Introduction of Masks
 on the, 58-73
 State Property on Provincial
 Soil, 469
 Romania, Report of, 352-357
 Romans blueblind? No, 225
 Romulus, Romos, Remus, 105

 Sallust, Hilary of Poitiers and, 477
 SANDERS, HENRY A. Review of
 Hoskier's Golden Latin
 Gospels, 218-220

- Sanskrit, European Palatals in,** 36-57
Suffixes -ment and -ent in, 91-98
SAUNDERS, CATHERINE. Introduction of Masks on the Roman Stage, 58-73
Schöne's Hug's Symposium (mentioned), 234
School-books in Graeco-Roman Egypt, 348
SCOTT, JOHN A. Repeated Verses in Homer, 313-321
Seneca, Author of Varronian Sentences, 224
Shewan's Lay of Dolon (mentioned), 236
Skymnos, The Periegesis of, 348
Slavic Analogy to Verner's Law, 431-435
SMITH, KIRBY FLOWER. Review of Clark's Ammianus, 344-347
Sonnenschein, Unity of the Latin Subjunctive, 479
Sophocles, Antigone, Composition of, 462
710, 476
O. C. 1135 (emended), 109
Stage, Antique, Grillparzer on the, 471
Starkie's Acharnians (mentioned), 116
Statius Scholia, 225
Thebais, the Argument thereof, 103
STELM, R. B. The Endings -ere and -erunt in Dactylic Hexameter, 328-332
Conditional Sentences in Livy (mentioned), 367
Stolz Grammar, Ariston Founder of, 473
Student Life in the IV Century A. D., 473
STURTEVANT, E. H. Notes on Juvenal, 322-327
Syntax of Early Latin, 338-343
Tacitus, Ann. I, 1 (Sine ira et studio), 103
Dialogus, 350
Tagalog Verbs, Derivative, 430-440
Tennyson's Exactness, 485
Theocritus in English Literature, 120-121
XXVII 50, 471
Theophrastus and Eustathius *περί ὑποκρίσεως,* 474
Thia, The Volcanic Island, 468
Thucydides 1, 24, 3, 108
Tibullus, First Elegy, 348
TOLMAN, H. C. Identification of the Ancient Persian Month Garmapada, 444-445
Trasimenus, Lacus, Battlefield of, 350
Tristan and Isolt, Love-Potion in, 354
Vahlen's Ennius, 1-35
Vance's Byzantinische Culturgeschichte, 118
Varronian Sentences belong to Seneca, 224
Vergil's Catalepton, 350; 448-458
Ecl. I 59-60, 108
Vergilian Interpretations of Donatus, 102
Vergiliana, 103
Vettius Valens, emended, 228
Villoison's Greek Palaeography, 227
Vitruvius, his Language, 227
Verner's Law, Slavic Analogy to, 431-435
WILSON, H. L. Burnam's Palaeographia Latina, 242
Latin Inscriptions at the Johns Hopkins University, 165-187
Wright's Studies in Menander (rev.), 363
Xenophon, Mem. I 1, 17-19, 471
and the Oxyrhynchus Historian, 467
Zander's Eurhythmia (mentioned), 116
Zippellius' Priene (mentioned), 487-8

THIS VOLUME DOES NOT
CIRCULATE

THIS VOLUME DOES NOT
CIRCULATE



ALF Collections Vault



3 0000 099 671 640